

Snowdon & Marycarr

From Father & N.

Christmas 1905.

Quakerism and Politics

BY ISAAC SHARPLESS, LL. D.

A QUAKER EXPERIMENT
IN GOVERNMENT.

*Popular Edition, two volumes in one, 12mo,
cloth, 560 pages, postpaid, \$1.50.*

*Illustrated Popular Edition, containing all
the matter and illustrations of the Haver-
ford Edition, two volumes in one, 12mo,
cloth, 612 pages, postpaid, \$2.00.*

FERRIS & LEACH, PUBLISHERS.

QUAKERISM AND POLITICS

Essays

BY ISAAC SHARPLESS, LL. D.

President of Haverford College



Philadelphia

FERRIS & LEACH

29 South Seventh Street

1905

COPYRIGHT, 1905, BY FERRIS & LEACH.

P R E F A C E .

These papers and addresses have been written for publication or delivery within a few years past and are now collected. For the most part they relate to features of early Pennsylvania History not usually emphasized. As a whole they are intended to show that the foundation principles of the colony, on which it greatly prospered,—liberty, peace, justice to Indians and negroes, simplicity and fidelity in government,—were logical outgrowths of the Quaker habit of mind and doctrine.

Whether men in business and politics can succeed and at the same time obey the dictates of pure morality is a question which troubles many people. Possibly a little light is thrown upon it by these papers.

The same statements would seem properly to have a place in more than one essay; hence repetitions exist

which in a connected narrative would be unpardonable.

The great political revolution in Philadelphia of the present month, in which Friends were prominent far out of proportion to their members, came too late to point certain obvious morals. If for no other purpose, it is interesting as disproving a popular idea that they are "non-resistants" when that word is used in reference to supine submission to the powers of evil.

I. S.

HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA.

November, 1905.

CONTENTS.

A Government of Idealists	17
The Causes of Pennsylvania's Ills	50
The Improvement of Pennsylvania Politics	65
The Friend in Politics	79
A Colonial Peace Controversy	111
The Welsh Settlers of Haverford	141
How the Friends Freed Their Slaves	159
The Friends' Meeting	179
The Basis of Quaker Morality	202



A GOVERNMENT OF IDEALISTS.*

A few years ago, in this suburban village of Bryn Mawr, the proprietor of a "speak-easy" essayed to do business on the Lancaster Pike. An official of a local organization was entrusted with its treasury, and requested to uproot the illegal enterprise. The only available method which presented itself was to employ a detective, gather evidence, and in the fulness of time make the arrest and take the case to court. This was successfully done, and a year in jail was probably something of a deterrent to others with similar ambitions. It is the sort of enforcement of law which is assumed to mark a proper spirit in a moral community. And yet, as day by day the detective in the guise of a laborer related the lies he had told, the young men he had enticed there to drink, the confidences he had violated, for all of which he was receiving his financial reward, it became a serious question whether the man who was selling a little beer and whiskey, a purely artificial crime, or the official who was paying another to violate some of the fundamental principles of morality, was in reality the greater sinner. Yet by some such processes many of

* This paper was read as the "Founders' Lecture" in Bryn Mawr College, 1905.

our proceedings in the interests of justice and good government are daily carried on.

This illustration may give an idea of the difficulty of applying abstract ethics to matters of government which are usually determined rather by the necessities and utilities of the day.

But if there is anything in Quaker morality fundamentally distinctive, it is a belief that there are eternal principles of right and wrong, which may not be violated no matter how attractive and beneficial the results of the violation may seem to be; that there is an overshadowing moral law as imperative as the law of gravitation before which all utilitarian considerations must take subordinate place; that righteousness must be done whatever the consequences, and that evil must be avoided whatever the risk, and that in this higher field of pure morality concession must not be made to weakness and imperfection and temporary circumstances.

For instance, *war*. War involves lying, stealing, killing, hatred, revenge, dissoluteness; therefore it cannot be right, says the Quaker, and arguments drawn from seeming necessity or State advantage fall to the ground. The Creator of the moral law knows what is best for man, and by always following his righteous decrees at whatever cost, the real progress of humanity is best subserved. Whatever is right is expedient, which is Paley's dictum reversed.

I am not now commending or condemning this position, for this lecture is historical and not ethical. I am stating it at the beginning, because I think that it explains the merits and the difficulties of the Friend when he attempts to govern. He simply, if consistent, cannot do a multitude of things which governments at this time, though it must be said with continually decreasing emphasis, demand.

Is it possible to manage a State on this Utopian theory? There has never been but one serious attempt to approximate to it, and that was the "Holy Experiment"—as he called it—of William Penn. We will briefly analyze its constitution and development, and trace wherein it seemed to succeed and wherein it seemed to fail.

Penn was one of a little band of ardent republicans who, in the unpromising time of the Stuart kings, held views far in advance of anything possible in the crystallized institutions of his own country. When in the payment of an old debt which Charles II. had contracted to his father, Admiral Sir William Penn, he received the grant of Pennsylvania with full powers to form a government to suit himself, the opportunity came as it does not come to one man in a century to create his ideal commonwealth, and to weave into it with almost a free hand his cherished principles of human right and privileges.

Would they work? Men said they would not.

Penn himself was not quite sure, and called the trial an experiment, and yet into that experiment he launched his whole fortune, his future chances for preferment, the reputation of his religious society, and the problem of the availability of its principles to meet the practical wants of humanity.

At the root of these principles lay the belief that to every man is given directly a conscious manifestation of God's will, which does not supersede the exercise of his own judgment and energy, but which in the higher realm of worship and ministry is supreme, and which clarifies his judgment and guides his energy, whenever its conditions are fulfilled, in the ordinary affairs of life. As the prophetic work of the world is to be done by this Divine inspiration, and as men and women everywhere might be the recipients of it, the value of the individual became transcendent. Artificial ranks went down to the ground, *thou* was a good enough pronoun for anyone, the Quaker would bow to no one, and his hat was left on his head as a token of equality in the presence of king and protector, judge and priest.

Penn was not only an exponent, but a leader and a teacher of these revolutionary theories. He had been in jail for them, he had written folios in advocacy of them, and he could not do otherwise than put them in practice when he led his Quaker colony to the virgin soil of his Delaware possessions. "I

would found a free colony for all mankind that shall go thither," he said.

Before he came over he gathered into one document his ideas of a constitution. This is a manuscript, in his own handwriting, now in the library of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, and which was never published till 1896. It decreed liberty of conscience, government by a popularly elected Assembly, which must obey the popular will, the initiative and the referendum (much as they now exist in Switzerland), prohibition of the retail sale of liquor in taverns and ale houses, and the extinction of many customs like imprisonment for debt, capital punishment for minor offenses, and the evils of prison management so conspicuous then in England. No provisions were made for any warlike operations, or for any oaths.

This constitution never went into effect, but it was the basis for that of the following year, with which the colony started, and which, twice modified by the force of the practical necessities of government, led the way to that of 1701, which was the great charter of the province for seventy-five years, when it went down with the whole colonial fabric in the throes of the Revolutionary War. This will bear a more detailed examination.

The first clause, as always in Penn's charters, decreed religious liberty to an extent hitherto unknown in any instrument of government in the world, except

among the little handful of people who made up the colony of Rhode Island. No person who professed to believe in an Almighty God was to be molested or interfered with or made to support any form of worship whatever, and no person who professed to believe in Jesus Christ should be excluded from any official station. This sounds very natural, possibly a little illiberal to us Americans to-day, but to appreciate its significance we must look at the condition of the idea of toleration.

That idea came into England about 1611 as an importation from Holland by the despised Anabaptists, or Baptists, as we now call them. It involved a State church, with other religions tolerated, as we see it in England to-day. It had a little vogue, especially among persecuted sects, but prior to 1640 it was nothing but a dream. Roger Williams, also a Baptist, announced the doctrine in his "Bloody Tenent of Persecution for the Cause of Conscience," in 1644, with much force, liberality and learning, and in his New England colony he put in practice not only toleration but religious liberty. For it is a long step from toleration—an established church supported by public money which everybody must contribute—to religious liberty and equality with no State forms whatever. It is exactly the step which separates England of to-day from America of to-day, giving them the restlessness over tithes and support

of church schools by taxes, so distressing to many tolerant and conscientious Englishmen, and from which we are free.

But the England of the Stuart times was far behind this. Dissenters were in jail by the thousands. They could not hold office or vote, or serve on juries, or be admitted to the universities. At certain times they could not worship together in companies of more than five. They were hounded and driven about, and made to feel at every turn their social and political inferiority. Under the Commonwealth it was not much better. For an Episcopal establishment was substituted a Presbyterian one, and "New Presbyter was but old Priest writ large." An act of this reformatory period decreed—so runs the statute—"that any man denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Divinity of Christ, or that the books of the Bible are the 'Word of God,' or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of judgment, shall suffer the pain of death."

The toleration act of William and Mary, of later date than the charter of Penn, but which he had large influence in passing, removed their actual physical sufferings, but not their political disabilities.

Nor, save in Rhode Island and a little time in Maryland, could any light or guidance come from the American colonies. Massachusetts and Connecticut

had their established congregational churches. Membership was a necessary qualification to vote or hold office. Up to 1691 barbarous persecution of dissenters went on. Episcopalians, Baptists and Quakers were imprisoned and banished, and four especially troublesome members of the latter sect were hanged on Boston Common. In New York the Episcopal Church, though a small minority of the population, was established and supported by money collected from all, though the Dutch worship was protected by the Treaty of Breda. Catholics were banished. In New Jersey, after 1702, liberty of conscience was proclaimed except for Papists and Quakers. In Maryland, which under Catholic rule had allowed large liberty of worship, the English Church was established in 1696, and the Catholics themselves disfranchised. Virginia allowed no dissent; all who did not bring their children to be baptized by the priests of the established church were subject to fine or imprisonment. Taking the Sacrament according to the rites of the same church was a necessary preliminary to a seat in the legislative Assembly in the Carolinas; while Georgia adopted the restrictions on Non-conformists established by the so-called Toleration Act of England.

Except by Roger Williams, the broad principles of religious liberty were nowhere grasped. Each sect objected to persecution, or disabilities, but it was be-

cause it held the truth and the others did not, and to establish this truth and crush out error was its normal duty. The English Puritans in New England did not found an asylum for religious liberty, but a reservation to establish their own ideas. "There is no room in Christ's triumphant army," Longfellow makes their minister, John Norton, to say, "for tolerationists."

It required no little courage for Penn, in the face of the universal reprobation of the time, to pledge himself: "Because the happiness of Mankind depends so much upon the enjoying of Liberty of their Consciences, as aforesaid, I do hereby solemnly declare, promise and grant for me, my heirs and assigns, that the first article of this charter, relating to liberty of Conscience, and every part and clause therein, according to the true intent and meaning thereof shall be kept and remain without any alteration, inviolably forever."

Penn might thus solemnly pledge himself and his heirs, but a higher power came in as a factor. In a few years the king's command required every Assemblyman and other official to sign a text abjuring a belief in the mass, transubstantiation and papal supremacy. They all took it, to Penn's disgust, though it is pretty hard to see how it was to be avoided, as they could do it honestly. Catholics were thus prohibited from office holding. Alone

among the colonies, however, Pennsylvania resolutely refused to prohibit the Catholic worship, and the little church of St. Joseph continued its ministrations all through the colonial days. Liberty of conscience became a keynote in Pennsylvania through all the provincial time until it was "writ large" in American institutions, in the Declaration of Independence and in the Federal Constitution, by the consent of all. That it was so placed is simply the testimony that within one hundred years all the colonies had occupied the Pennsylvania position.

The second article of Penn's Charter of 1701 was scarcely less momentous. It decreed that an Assembly should be chosen on the first day of October forever, that it should choose its own officers, be the judge of the qualifications of its own members, and adjourn itself and have "all other powers and privileges of an Assembly according to the rights of the free-born subjects of England, and as is usual in any of the King's Plantations in America."

This, too, seems to us a very simple provision, so used are we to our Federal and State legislatures sitting under just such rules. And yet it was the same century which had seen the Civil War in England for these rights and others springing from them, and which at this very time seemed likely to lose them by the unconditioned restoration of Charles II. It was the same century in which the king of England had

declared, "Remember that Parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting and dissolution, and therefore, as I find the fruits of them to be good or evil, they are to continue or not to be;" when members were called from their seats and committed to the Tower for plainly speaking their judgment; when no Parliament was called for eleven years, and ship money and star chamber were used illegally to extort money not voted by Parliament; when even the Lord Protector, chosen as a protest against these very evils, used his "purge" to carry the point, and ruled with a Parliament from which nearly all independence had been excluded. Even now in England it is possible for a minister to govern for years by a Parliament elected for a special purpose, and which does not represent the people.

These usurpations were fresh in Penn's mind. He reprinted with a liberal introduction the Magna Charta and other charters of English liberty, lest the distant colonists should forget their rights, and he plainly declared, "I propose that which is extraordinary, to leave myself and my successors no power of doing mischief." He had the Assembly decree a franchise, twice as liberal as Connecticut, the most democratic of the other colonies, and with ten times the voting power of old England. All through these seventy-five years of provincial Pennsylvania the free Assembly stood for the people, and wrung from

proprietor and crown one concession after another of liberty and privilege. It made many mistakes, and often ungraciously demanded more than was reasonable, but it made the province so free and so satisfied that she went into the Revolution with reluctance, and failed to catch the spirit of independence which stirred the New Englanders and Virginians under their more difficult charters.

The third clause of the Constitution of 1701 related to the manner of electing officers, and the fourth gave the power of veto to the governor, who was also the proprietor. This meant no harm under William Penn, but his sons were by no means broad-minded philanthropists, but rather farmers of a great domain for pecuniary profit. They deputed their veto power to a lieutenant, and lived much in England. Vetoes became frequent and embarrassing. But the resources of the Assembly were equal to the occasion. They alone could vote this deputy a salary. Thus, in 1743, they had a refractory governor to deal with. He would not sign bills which they had much at heart, and they would forget to place an item for his salary in the appropriation bill. He nursed his wrath in poverty for a time, but finally showed signs of giving way. A little money was voted him. He signed a bill, and the Assembly responded with equal generosity. He yielded the main contention, and all

arrears were paid. He was permanently reclaimed and lived happily with them ever afterwards.

The fifth clause gave a criminal the same rights to witnesses and counsel as the prosecution, and the sixth prevented the Governor and his council from determining any matter of property which properly belonged to the courts. The use of the courts as instruments of terrorizing criminals and the extortion of money by executive process could never exist in Pennsylvania as they were in Penn's own time existing in England.

The seventh declared that no person could keep a tavern unless he were recommended by the county justices as of proper character, a process beyond which we have not yet advanced.

The eighth safeguarded the rights of inheritance of the wife and children of a suicide in his estate, and prohibited the forfeiture to the Governor of the property of a person killed by casualty or accident. To appreciate the need of these seemingly useless provisions we must make a brief excursion into English law.

That law held that if a suicide has previously committed a felony, or if he acts through anger or ill-will, his lands escheat and his chattels are forfeited to the crown; but if he acts from "weariness of life or impatience of pain," his lands descend to his heirs and his chattels are forfeited. In all cases it was

adjudged by most authorities as a case of murder and treated accordingly.

In the case of an accidental death, a very ancient custom decrees the forfeiture of the moving thing which caused the death. Thus in Exodus: "If an ox gore a man then the ox shall be surely stoned." Under the name of "deodand" in the Middle Ages the moving thing was to be sold for the repose of the soul of the victim, or in pious uses among the poor to appease the wrath of God. Later it was forfeit to the feudal lord or the king. Here is an old illustration: "As if a man being upon a cart, carrying fagots and binding them together, fall down by the moving of one of the horses in the cart, and die of it, both that and all the other horses in the cart and the cart itself are forfeit." Deodands, then, were simply goods forfeited as the result of accident involving no criminality or even necessarily carelessness.

These old laws, both as to suicides and deodands, stood in England till the time of Victoria, about 1845, all the time working their unjust effect upon the heirs of the unfortunate victims. Their prohibition in Penn's charter thus acquires its significance.

One other clause prohibits the amendment of the charter except by the consent of the Governor and six-sevenths of the legislature. The whole charter covers but two or three pages of ordinary print, and

is suggestive quite as much from what it omits as from what it contains, as, for instance, the treatment of the natives and questions of war and oaths.

It is the Indian policy of Penn which has been most eulogized. The Treaty under the Shackamaxon elm tree has been immortalized by Voltaire in print and by West on canvas. Yet history compels the admission that no treaty such as we usually have in our thoughts, by which Penn bought a great State of the Indians, ever was held. He bought little sections here and there from various Indian tribes as the settlers demanded the space, extending from one creek to another, and back into the country as far as a man could walk in a day or two days. When two tribes claimed the same territory he bought of both. He explained the contract in full, satisfied every reasonable objection, was always manifestly open and honest, and as might be expected, met with an open and honest response. Thus as a bit of local history, we have this record of the council in 1685: "Read a complaint of the inhabitants of Haverford against the Indians for the rapine and destruction of their hogs." The Indian chiefs were sent for, and they quickly settled the marauders. Thus it is that the best of terms were maintained notwithstanding individual worries on both sides, and not a shred of sharp practice was ever charged against William Penn and the elders that outlived him. So the

much-lauded treaty, if not exactly historic, is worth its place as a symbol of fair treatment of natives who elsewhere were goaded into resistance and bloody reprisals.

Was this the cause of Indian peace on the colonial frontier? Parkman says, skeptically: "Had the Quakers planted their settlement on the banks of the St. Lawrence, or among the warlike tribes of New England, it may well be doubted whether their shaking of hands and assurances of tender regard would long have availed to save them from the visitations of the scalping knife." John Fiske more recently adopts the same view. While giving full credit to what he calls Quaker justice, he adds: "Nevertheless, it seems to me quite clear that in the long peace enjoyed by Pennsylvania the controlling factor was not Quaker justice, but Indian politics."

The opinions of such careful students are worthy of all consideration. The historical causes of any event are often so complicated that there are abundant opportunities for speculation as to which one among many produced it. We may readily admit that the circumstances were peculiarly favorable for Penn's Experiment. His colony was practically secure from French attack by sea. It did not touch the French possessions in Canada. There were friendly provinces north and east and south of it. Its Indians were in a state of semi-vassalage to the Iro-

quois, and were living, not contentedly, perhaps, but actually, under the imputation of being "women."

Whether these conditions would have secured peace without the addition of "Quaker justice" is a matter upon which opinions may properly differ. Also whether "Quaker justice" would have triumphed under less favorable conditions—if, for instance, Penn had secured a grant in New England—is a problem admitting of various answers.

The most reasonable seems to me to be an affirmative answer. The Indian qualities were those of savages. Their treachery and cruelty to enemies were extreme, but the general testimony is that they were faithful in their friendships. So say Heckewelder and Zeisberger, who lived with them and knew them well from the standpoint of missionaries; so also says General W. H. Harrison, from the standpoint of an Indian fighter: "A long and intimate knowledge of them in peace and war, as enemies and friends, has left upon my mind the most favorable impressions of their character for bravery, generosity and fidelity to their engagements."

Indians, like white men in war, did not consider the guilt of the individual, but attacked without discrimination all members of the opposing party. When the war paint was on, and the red tomahawk was unsheathed, every white was an enemy, though even then Indians have again and again discriminated

in favor of a friend. They acknowledged no international laws shielding non-combatants, and their warfare was extreme in its barbarity, and without respect of persons. When, however, they were unprovoked; when they had been treated with fairness and kindness, and had not exhausted the ordinary resources of their diplomacy; when, according to their code, they were still friends and allies, they were faithful to their engagements, and war arguments were used upon them in vain. Traditions, as binding with them as the written treaties of the whites, carried down from generation to generation the sacredness of the ties of friendship. "In commemoration of these conferences (with William Penn)," says Heckewelder, "they frequently assembled together in the woods in some shady spot, as near as possible similar to those where they used to meet their brother Mignon, and there laid all his 'words' or speeches with those of his descendants on a blanket or clean piece of bark, and with great satisfaction went successively over the whole. This practice (which I have frequently witnessed) continued until the year 1780, when the disturbances which then took place put an end to it, probably forever."

Every piece of wampum stood imperishably for a certain transaction. Again and again its associations were rehearsed in the presence of the young

braves, and they were exhorted to be faithful to the obligations their elder brethren had taken upon themselves. Nothing would relieve them except such violent treatment as would break its sacred validity. It seems, therefore, not at all certain that the bonds of gratitude, friendship and fidelity to engagements would not have been sufficient to have kept the Indians friendly, in the face of internecine wars and French intrigue, had the whites everywhere shown the uprightness of William Penn and his friends.

The French, who treated them better than the English, had but little cause to complain of the faithlessness of their allies, and the Iroquois, who were "robbed by land speculators, cheated by traders, and feebly supported in their constant wars with the French," were yet staunch in their loyalty to the Dutch and their successors, the English. If stress is laid upon the fact that Pennsylvania Indians were "women," it must be remembered that no warriors were more fearless or cruel when the "Walking Purchase" and other knaveries had in their minds canceled their obligations to the provincial government. They were the fiercest of the border ruffians, and brought their old enemies and feudal lords to terms.

Quaker justice prevailed and Indian peace resulted—and yet the Pennsylvania idea involved something more than peace when peace rested on justice. It in-

volved peace in the face of unjust attack—peace as a principle of eternal morality—peace when the Indians were scalping on the frontier, and the French privateers were on the Delaware; when the question whether England or France should control the new world was at stake; when war was declared, and the legislature was asked to appropriate money and buy guns and arm troops. The Friends could only control their own membership, and they always granted to those who thought differently on this crucial matter the right to their own course of action. Even, it must be admitted, they were down in the bottom of their hearts glad, when the lack of scruples of others relieved them from a serious dilemma. For Penn had accepted with his charter from King Charles, the rights of a Captain-General with ample powers, rights which he could not exercise himself, for he had written much against wars and fightings, and in 1693 had proposed a Diet of Nations, with a central parliament to settle disputes, a result which is just now a realized accomplishment at The Hague. So he appointed non-Quaker deputies to do the martial work which the king commanded—that is, an occasional impotent proclamation of war against France or Spain, or a communication to the Assembly to vote money for some naval or military attack, which he did not expect them to grant.

It was different with that body—always with a

Quaker majority from 1682 to 1756. That majority could not escape the responsibility. They were elected as peace men, though often the voters who elected them were not peace men themselves. Sometimes they voted money "for the king's use," and if war purposes and peace purposes were so inextricably blended that they could not be sure how their money went, they felt freed from responsibility, though they did extort from a governor a promise that their money "should not be dipt in blood." Once they voted to supply "wheat and other grain" to feed the Indians, and Franklin says made no serious protest when the "other grain" was construed by the governor to mean gunpowder. When a lot of border ruffians came in from the Susquehanna and encamped in Germantown, with a threat to exterminate a tribe of Moravian Indians in the care of the province and then in Philadelphia, their young men took up arms and warded off the attack, and their elders, after some show of opposition, did not condemn them. They drew the line between police and military protection, the former being directed, they said, against those who knew they were violating both human and divine laws, and were personally deserving of all they got, and the latter against many who were innocent of wrong-doing, even conscientious in the means they took to accom-

plish what to them was a worthy end. To shoot down such people with such convictions seemed an immoral act.

And yet with all their evasions and explanations in minor detail, they were reasonably true to their principle, though it was often a heavy burden. Supported by the German sects which had many of the same beliefs, they for seventy years wove it into the fabric of their commonwealth, meeting each issue as it arose, retaining popular support and sending men to office whose abilities and integrity were unchallenged.

Liberty was as much of an experiment in 1682 as peace. In a century it won its place among our distinct American institutions. The other virtue has had no such rapid triumph, but he who reads the signs of the times in the advocacy of arbitration will have but little doubt of its ultimate acceptance.

Other testimonies of perhaps less general import have become acknowledged principles of civilization. As early as 1716 the Friends cautioned their members to avoid lotteries. Soon the subject became one of annual inquiry, and those who indulged came under the censure of the meeting.

It was after the Revolution, and especially in the prosperous times following the adoption of the Federal Constitution, that the ubiquity of lotteries was most conspicuous. "There was a wheel in every

city and in every town large enough to boast of a court-house or jail." * All improvements were made by their means, school houses, public offices, bridges and roads, churches and colleges. The University of Pennsylvania and Princeton College had their lotteries. ~~Many a church edifice owes its origin to~~ Federal capital was promoted by huge national lotteries. Many a church edifice owes its origin to them. It is true there were some protests. It was claimed that artisans were drawn from their work and steady habits by the enticement of the wheel; that many a home was demoralized, and that for one person who seemed to prosper a dozen were sunk into poverty. Yet the sanction of great names, and the tangible effects in enterprises accomplished, continued to justify their use, and it was well into the last century before States began to make prohibitory laws. Now they are forbidden in every part of the Union, and the Federal mails are closed against them.

From all this the Friends escaped. No meeting or school or enterprise of theirs was ever the result of lotteries. It might also be said that individually they were clear of participation in them. For the annual inquiry was rigid and honest, and the ticket purchaser must have kept his transaction very secret if his case was not taken up by the Monthly Meeting.

* McMaster.

The long-standing contest against oaths is another interesting development. The original idea that all oaths should be forbidden in the Province had been given up out of deference to the views of those who considered them essential. So the expedient of making them optional came in, and is now general. The only hardship resulting is that those who have a conscience against them cannot hold an office the duties of which include administering them.

But while most people seem to be satisfied with this liberty of choice, indications are not lacking that the civilized world will come to the original position of Penn and his associates.

Milton says that the nature of an oath consists in "calling God to witness the truth of what we say with a curse upon ourselves, either implied or expressed, should it prove false." The imprecatory clause is the final one, "So help me God." This means, not a prayer to God to aid me in speaking the truth, but a renunciation of God's pardon and help in the day of judgment if the truth is not spoken (or the deed performed). In the multiplicity of cases in which an oath or its equivalent is taken in judicial procedure and business life, this awful curse is called for unthinkingly and irreverently on trifling occasions. The habit of careless swearing is thus begotten, and the oath, by breaking down the taker's sense of reverence for truth, becomes an aid to false state-

ments rather than the reverse. No one assumes that an affirmation is less binding than an oath, provided the same penalties are attached to violation. The imprecation is, therefore, not necessary to secure fidelity, and the whole mass of procedure based on its enforcement of the veracity or faithfulness of the witness or official seems unnecessary. Any reference to God may also be objected to on the ground of the inexpediency of using lightly the name of the Deity. There are, besides, perfectly veracious agnostics whose testimony has been excluded because they are unwilling to state categorically that they believe in God. The safe and easy rule would be to require a simple affirmation or declaration in every case, affixing to falsehood the penalties now attached to perjury.

Constitutional difficulties stand in the way of this radical change, but as a step towards it the law enacted in Maryland, in 1898, is suggestive and valuable. "The form of oath to be taken and administered in this State shall be as follows: 'In the presence of Almighty God I do solemnly promise (or declare,)' etc., and it shall not be lawful to add to the oath, 'So help me God,' or any imprecatory words whatever." This is hardly an oath at all in the common definition of the word. It is practically the form used in early Pennsylvania.

So with the oft-told story of slavery abolition. The

last negroes held by Quaker masters were freed during the Revolutionary War, and in 1680 first among the States she passed an abolition law, to be followed in a few months by Massachusetts.

“Thus,” Bancroft sums it up, “did Penn perfect his government. An executive dependent for its support on the people; all subordinate officers elected by the people; the judiciary dependent for its existence upon the people; all legislation originating exclusively in the people; no forts, no armed force, no militia; no established church; no difference of rank; and a harbor open for the reception of all mankind of every nation, of children of every language and every creed; could it be that the invisible power of reason would be able to order and restrain, to punish crime and to protect property?”

It was a government of idealists, but of practical ones. They had taken risks when they applied what they thought were the principles of pure morality to government, but good fortune, or, as they thought, a good Providence, was propitious and they prospered. As Andrew Hamilton, the great lawyer of the Colony, said in 1737, it was not to their fertile land, or great rivers, or physical advantages of any sort that they owed their prosperity, but “to the Constitution of Mr. Penn.” The first settlers were the Quaker sectarians seeking exemption from bitter persecution and disability in England, who filled the

southeastern corner. Then came the sympathetic sects of Germany, kindly intelligent people, with learned leaders, like Pastorius, Kelpius and Sauer. Then the masses from the Palatinate, ravaged by war and starved beyond endurance, who, an ancient account says, looked into each others' eyes and said, "Let us go to Pennsylvania, and if we die, we die." They came by the thousands to the State where there would be no wars, so that the province, so far as numbers were concerned, was as much German as British at the outbreak of the Revolution. Then the Scotch, settled a century before in the north of Ireland, whose leases were now running out, and who feared the establishment of Episcopacy among them, came in other thousands to the frontiers of the State where their beloved Presbyterianism would never be invaded by state churches. No other colony on the Atlantic seaboard grew so rapidly, and, though a half century behind the others in time of settlement, at the date of the Revolution it led them all in numbers, and this growth of common people was directly due, as Hamilton has said, "to the Constitution of Mr. Penn."

There are many unkind reflections thrown by others at the proverbial "slowness" of Philadelphians. I have even heard that a judicial decision has decreed that it is not murder to kill one, because he is dead already. It was not, however, only com-

mon people,—mild, non-resistant Quakers, and phlegmatic Germans and uncouth Scotch-Irishmen—who were drawn to Pennsylvania by its liberal policy. The leaders of thought of America came there because thought was free. A group of scientists, Franklin, Priestley, Rittenhouse, Bartram, Rush, Marshall, Audubon, Nuttall and others, gathering together in such institutions as the American Philosophical Society, still in honored existence, created a progressive scientific spirit in an atmosphere of real academic freedom. The capital city itself was the largest, best-governed, most modern of any on the Atlantic Coast. Idealistic institutions brought prosperity, and with it intellectual alertness and moral keenness of perception, and if slowness is now a merited reprobation, it has grown up since the Revolution, and as the result of causes not associated with the principles of the province.

And yet if we go back over the seventy-four years of Quaker domination, it is very evident that these institutions did not work themselves out without a large amount of shrewd political manipulation. At first, when all were Friends, they could afford to divide and struggle, city against country, aristocrat against democrat, for the management of affairs; then followed (1711 to 1740) a golden era, when everything was in harmony—no Indian wars, no calls for troops,

abounding prosperity, quiet and economical government which suited all. A great Quaker political machine was built up. It is useless in this day to cry out against machines in politics. The man without a party is hopeless, and as in industry and labor, charity and church, so in politics, organization has come in response to the undeniable demand of the time for efficiency. During this thirty years' peace the Friends had everything their own way. The Germans did not much vote, and when they did, it was for their Quaker allies. The Scotchmen had not come in very large numbers, but they instinctively took the opposite side from their doctrinal antipodes; for they were Calvinists in the Church and fighters in the State. They triumphed in the Revolution, but their time had not yet come.

Then came the troublous years, for a decade and a half following 1740, when there were wars and still more rumors of wars. Governor George Thomas, appointed by Thomas Penn, tried to force an appropriation for England's quarrels with Spain and France, from the Quaker Assembly. A great pamphlet war followed, in which the merits and impossibilities and limitations of a government without armed troops were discussed in every coffee house and country tavern of the province. If any curious student wishes to read it he will find it in the Colonial

Records of the Governor's Council and the Votes of the Assembly—and let him remember that, like the speeches in Congress to-day, it was intended quite as much for public as for official perusal. When matters were thus stirred up, came a street fight, with sailors beating up the enthusiasm for the Governor and hard-fisted Germans from the country for the Quakers, and then the election, and in both street fight and election the Quakers triumphed. Though by this time they only constituted a small minority of the population, 40,000 out of 220,000, Dr. William Smith, the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, tells us, yet they never failed to secure almost an unanimous control of the Legislature. They did this by the aid of the German vote and the power of their well-organized political machine. No way of overcoming this seemed possible to the learned doctor, except to disfranchise all non-English speaking people, prohibit the German almanac of Christopher Sauer, and make all Quakers ineligible for office by the imposition of an oath instead of an affirmation. These measures would have done it effectually, but the Friends themselves rendered them unnecessary.

In 1755 Braddock's army went down before Fort Duquesne. The Indians, incited by English knavery and French intrigue, were let loose on the frontiers, and tomahawk and scalping knife did their bloody

work. In the midst of this the election came off, with bitterness and wild charges on both sides. When the smoke cleared away, twenty-eight of the thirty-six Assemblymen were Friends. Even the border counties sent them up. They appropriated money for forts, for provisions for the English troops, for suffering frontiersmen, and to win back the alienated natives. This was as far as they would go, and when in the spring of 1756 the Governor declared war against the French and Indians, as he was constitutionally empowered to do, they resigned their seats, and this was the end of Penn's Holy Experiment.

Because an institution has a moral basis, it does not therefore do away with the need of wisdom and skill in management. Speaker Reed has defined a statesman "as a successful politician who is dead." Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt have been excellent politicians. They have skillfully adapted means to ends. They have made friends where they could, and placated enemies where the enemies could command votes. They did not live on a distant height, and say to the people, "If you need my services, rise up and ask them." They said in effect, "I want to be President, and I will use all decent means to get the place." Neither, on the other hand, did they, as is said of certain aspirants for Congressional honors, allow their constituents to dictate their principles. They had prin-

ciples, by which they stood, but there must be "give and take" in politics, the use of effective methods, yielding something to get more, trades and bargains and subserviency to the organization, within certain limits. One can imagine even a moral detective, an ethical Sherlock Holmes, who by shrewdness and keen insight succeeds in his trade, and is a valuable and satisfactory ally of progress and justice. And yet the early Pennsylvanians asked, Is not all this limited when it comes up against the moral law, and do not shrewdness and opportunism and expediency cease to have a place when that inexorable command is heard, "Thou shalt not!"?

Early Pennsylvania as an experiment is worth more attention than it has received. There were many weaknesses which have not been brought out in this paper. The basis of morality was probably defective in many points. Except Penn and a very few others, the people did not rise to a full comprehension of the importance of the history they were creating. They were often opportunists, as we are still when we hire detectives to lie for us when we want to stop the illegal sale of whiskey. They violated their own principles dozens of times. And yet it is true that for three-score years and ten they *did* carry on a government, and a good one, based measurably on these idealistic conditions. For three generations they struggled for principles, and willingly went

down at the end rather than violate them; and rather remarkably the world has been coming largely to their view-point.

It is not so much the establishment of any special theory of government that colonial Pennsylvania stands for. It stands for fidelity to ideals in the face of apparent disaster. It says, "O ye of little faith, do the right, and some day the right will justify itself and you."

Some of Penn's principles, as civil and religious liberty, we have built into our political edifice, and we cease to question their places there. To some we do the homage of asserting their applicability to the purer conditions of the future, too timid to do what we know to be right, and set them to work now with confidence in their inherent vitality. We forget that truth makes its own way if given a chance, and that out of our own failures often come the successes of the future. These successes will never be produced by waiting for better circumstances, but they are brought on by Holy Experiments, where with faith and courage right principles are set to work in the midst of a scoffing and perverse generation.

THE CAUSES OF PENNSYLVANIA'S ILLS.*

That Pennsylvania was settled by Quakers, and that her present political condition is a subject of grave solicitude to her best friends within and without the State, are statements which cannot be controverted. The attempt to connect them by a chain of cause and effect is a tempting project of historical inquiry. Political conditions, like a rainstorm or a cold wave, do not arise spontaneously, but the causes are often too remote or too complicated to make causation evident or speculation profitable.

In common parlance Philadelphia is the Quaker City, and its representatives, whether in political conventions or ball fields, are Quakers. In some occult way, the characteristics of city and State, green shutters, rectangular streets, building societies, coal mines, the Pennsylvania Railroad, John Wanamaker and Matthew Stanley Quay, are logical descendants of George Fox. To this list, according to "A Pennsylvanian" in the October "Atlantic," we must add

* This paper was published in the *Atlantic Monthly* of January, 1902, in reply to an article entitled, "The Ills of Pennsylvania," of prior date, which attributed the evil political condition of the State to the non-militant habits impressed upon it by its Quaker founders. The paper is here reprinted with the kind assent of the publishers.

the political iniquities as coming directly from the same prolific origin. In support of this he quotes Theodore Roosevelt in a passage from his "Life of Benton," which passage the author has since modified or explained, but which is reputed, according to "A Pennsylvanian," to have cost him fifty thousand votes out of a total Quaker population of one hundred and twenty thousand, nearly all of whom, as a matter of fact, supported the Republican electors. This tribute to the extent of Quaker influence does the Society of Friends too much honor, and needs to be seriously examined.

William Penn was an idealist, and was far removed from mercenary considerations in the founding of his State. A disappointed would-be purchaser of trading rights says, with surprise, "I believe truly he does aim more at justice and righteousness and spreading of truth than at his own particular gain." He was an enthusiast for liberty, for justice, and for peace, and to these causes he sacrificed a noble inheritance of money and station, and the quiet and comfort of his life. Many of his co-religionists did not at first appreciate the wisdom of his generous plans. To one of these who had argued for special privileges for Quakers he objects, "We should look selfish and do that which we have cried out upon others for, namely, letting nobody touch with government but those of their own way"; and again, with a note of

exultation, he says, "I went thither to lay the foundation of a free colony for all mankind that should go thither." His "Fundamental Constitutions," recently discovered in his own handwriting, the first announcement of his plan of government, was liberal beyond any previous publication of serious practical import, and was toned down by friends to suit supposed necessities.

It can hardly be claimed that the rank and file of his followers rose to the standard of his conceptions. They were mainly English yeomen, who had been for years under the fire of severe persecution, and were seeking peace and freedom for themselves in Penn's Woods. Yet from the very nature of their religious views they could not do otherwise than embrace rather broad principles of liberty, fraternity and equality. The divine message directly committed to the custody of human agency knew no bounds of wealth, learning or sex. He or she who received it was set apart by no permanent canonization. There was perfect equality of spiritual opportunity, and perfect liberty of spiritual action. Even the smaller peculiarities were testimonies to universal fellowship. The *thee* and the *thou* were applied to all, instead of being addressed, as was the custom of the age, to inferiors only. The refusal to take off the hat was a protest against the obsequiousness which had recently been imported from the Continent. The offer to fill

out the terms of imprisonment of suffering brethren, even when the prison would be the grave, was made again and again in all seriousness, while the feeling toward the persecutors was entirely devoid of malignity.

This people learned well the lesson that human rights were the inheritance of all men, and not of those only who held "the truth." When they came to America, it was not to found a little reservation, built upon their own ideas of Biblical authority and ecclesiastical propriety, and then to keep it sacred by imprisoning and whipping and hanging dissenters. They generalized from their own condition, and enacted for all the liberties they wished to enjoy themselves. The first clause of every charter of Penn—including that of 1701, which lasted till the Revolution—was a full grant of freedom of worship to all "who confess and acknowledge Almighty God." There was, however, what then amounted to a small restriction in office-holding to those who "profess to believe in Jesus Christ." This restriction was increased by legislative action to include subscription to a test which barred Catholics from official life, and so matters remained during provincial days. There were no restrictions on worship, and a Catholic church was in nearly continuous exercise of its functions; but the government could be carried on by Protestant Christians only. No other founder,

except Roger Williams, grasped even approximately this large truth, now so universally accepted. It was more than toleration. Dissenting sects were more than endured; they held with the dominant body, on terms of equality, all civil and political rights.

This did not abolish denominational intensity. Presbyterian and Quaker differed bitterly in dogma and method, and their zeal against each other threw them into opposing political parties. They were keenly alive to each other's iniquities, and profoundly assured of their own rectitude. Political equality did not seem to breed indifference to moral obliquity, nor was official malfeasance—any more than under the exclusive hierarchy of Massachusetts—a matter not to be rigorously combated. In addition to righteous government this sentiment of equality gave the people a clear moral insight, which made witchcraft and other crazes impossible.

The theory conquered. Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Maryland became the models in managing religious differences. The makers of the Federal and State constitutions chiseled into them imperishably the doctrines of civil and religious liberty.

The other principle which the Pennsylvania settlers had at heart—peace—had no such triumphant career. Yet it doubtless seemed to Penn, in his enthusiasm, no less important and no less likely to succeed than liberty. When he said, "There may be

room there, if not here, for such a Holy Experiment," it is probable that he had most clearly in mind the separation from warlike spirit and impulses and neighbors. Justice to the Indians, though right in itself, became doubly important to him in maintaining pacific relations within the colony. The famous treaty under the elm tree, in its descriptions more artistic than historic, symbolized not only honest dealings, but also the elimination of forts, soldiers and guns from the list of colonial necessities—a condition which continued for seventy years.

It conveys a wrong impression to call these Quakers non-resistants and non-combatants. They did not hold the views of which Tolstoi is now the most distinguished exponent. They believed in fairness, in insistence on reason and its forcible presentation, and on force up to the point where force used criminal methods. During all the colonial period they constituted the liberty party of the province, and wrung from successive governors one concession after another. They showed ability to resist bravely and successfully whenever their rights were invaded. In the struggles with the Crown and Parliament which preceded the Revolution, they were united in opposition, and adopted heartily the measures of non-importation and protest which characterized the policy of John Dickinson. There are good reasons for believing that during the war the sympathies of

the great majority were with the Americans, and several hundred of them, though under the disapprobation of their ecclesiastical bodies, gave active aid to the Revolutionary cause.

The opposition was to methods, not to resistance itself. They held that differences could generally be settled by common sense and forbearance; that moral resistance, to its fullest extent, was better than suffering iniquity to prevail; and that a citizen's duty was to oppose vigorously, and, if need be, suffer bravely, rather than to condone wrong in others or do it himself. They had achieved a memorable triumph in England the previous century, and secured, with some completeness, their civil and religious rights there, by methods demanding great endurance and strenuous resistance to persecution, and they were not convinced that the same methods would not be successful in America. They stopped at war, because they thought it was a crime; that the hatred, the killing, the stealing, and all the immoralities which cluster around war were wrong in themselves, and could not be justified by results to be gained, or the supposed inadequacy of right means to meet the situation. Such was Quaker non-resistance. That it would tend to make men tolerant of evil or indifferent to its effect is, at the mildest, a doubtful proposition.

It may be conceded that the province was saved

from some difficulty by its Episcopalian governors. The Quaker Assembly would not interfere with calling out voluntary militia and other warlike operations, if they were not themselves involved, and no consciences were forced. Possibly they felt like the Quaker boat captain of later date, who was being crowded out by more aggressive competitors at the Delaware wharves, and who, in despair, called to his mate, "Thee will have to come here and use some of thy language." It may be a question in casuistry how far a man is justified in allowing others to do things innocently against which his own conscience protests. There was not much of this, however, and as a matter of fact they managed affairs, without defenses or arms or martial display, for two generations.

As a result, to a very large extent, of the prevalence of these ideas of liberty and peace, the Quaker colony greatly prospered. "It is not to the fertility of our soil," said Speaker Andrew Hamilton, a man much respected and a non-Quaker, in 1739, "that we ought chiefly to attribute the great progress this province has made. . . . It is practically and almost wholly owing to the excellency of our Constitution." Founded later than any of the original colonies except Georgia, it grew more rapidly than any, and at the Revolution was among the first three in wealth and population. It was the only one whose paper

currency never depreciated. It had absolute security from Indian invasion and internal broils while Quaker rule lasted. Its free thought created the soil upon which alone science could grow. Franklin, tired of the dogmatism of Massachusetts, found a congenial atmosphere in Pennsylvania. Priestley, driven from England, found sympathy and a home on the banks of the Susquehanna. Rittenhouse, Bartram, Audubon, Rush, Marshall and many others constituted a conclave of scientists unequaled elsewhere in America. Philadelphia was the best governed, most enterprising, and most important city of the colonies at the beginning of the Revolution.

But Pennsylvania did not have a homogeneous population of Quakers. It is doubtful if there were ever more than forty thousand of them in the colony at any one time, with perhaps eight thousand voters. That this little group could stamp a State so as to resist or greatly modify the vast development of the succeeding century is in itself improbable. There was the German immigration, far exceeding them in numbers, which gave them political allies, but which brought in a different sort of people. There was the Scotch-Irish immigration, also their numerical superiors, and always restive under their control,—restive to the extent of demanding with great acrimony separate statehood for Western Pennsylvania. In the north the Connecticut settlers claimed the whole

length of the State for New England, and defended their claim by guns and forts,—a controversy which was not settled till 1782. This heterogeneous population prevented the unity of feeling and State pride possible elsewhere, and may account for the fact that the worst side of Pennsylvania is always shown to the world,—that her weaknesses and iniquities are heralded in their fullness by her own sons whenever they tell against a rival party.

The determining factors of the present conditions, however, have arisen since the Revolution. They have overridden the influences of race and religion, and have worked the same political results among the militant Presbyterians of the west as among the peaceful Quaker-settled counties of the southeast. They are products of geography and mineralogy, and would have wrought their consequences, with some modifications, had the province of Pennsylvania been settled by the Puritans of New England, the Cavaliers of Virginia, or the Creoles of Louisiana.

The line of travel to and from the West lay across the State for four hundred miles. The stream of emigration, and later the returning stream of produce, when menaced by the Erie Canal, demanded great concerted business organizations. The State itself undertook to solve the problem, and built canals and horse and “portage” railways connecting the Ohio with the Delaware. The debt mounted up to

forty million dollars, and the political evils were even more serious. After the panic of 1837, when trade almost ceased and the objects of State taxation became unremunerative, the treasury staggered along a little time, and then paid interest in promissory notes. Sydney Smith's brilliant diatribes and Wordsworth's milder reproaches have advertised Pennsylvania's disgrace to the world. But they wrote too soon. Every dollar of the debt was paid, with interest on the delayed interest. Not only so, but the demand to sell the unprofitable and demoralizing investment was too strong for politicians to resist, and there was a not discreditable settlement of the whole matter.

But the need for the line still remained. There was only a transference from management by the State itself to management by companies deriving their powers from the State. The legislature was still the source of wealth and power.

At the same time came the development of the unrivaled mineral resources of the State. Canals, and afterward railways, were run in every direction. Individual fortunes were unable to open and work the mines of coal and iron, and to develop the raw material into an available shape for practical use. A State of farmers, or of small textile manufacturers, or of diversified industries, would have no temptation to connect politics and business; a State with the

wealth of the world within its reach, but dependent on legislative favor, was drawn by irresistible allurements to give a mercenary tone to its public life, and lose sight of high ideals in an intoxicating commercial prosperity.

Prior to the Civil War the tariff question did not affect politics. Pennsylvania, normally Democratic, wanted a tariff, and both parties were willing to grant it. But when the cause became identified with the fortunes of the Republican party, majorities of two or three hundred thousand were easy. Workmen had noticed that low rates were coincident with low wages, scanty work, and suffering. Whether right or not, they concluded that coincidence meant consequence, and went bodily into the Republican ranks. There has been no steady, healthy opposition in Pennsylvania or Philadelphia since the war. So it has come to pass that the wealth of natural resources, the coal and iron of the hills, and their inevitable connection with legislation, have been the undoing of political morality. They have made Pennsylvania rich beyond the dreams of our grandfathers, and have brought a reliable and abiding commercial prosperity. Men with vast interests confided to their care, to be worked for their own and their clients' benefit, and with golden prospects before them, have adjudged their duty to these interests to be superior to their duty to the

State and to morality, or they have argued that attention to business prosperity *was* their duty to the State and to morality.

These facts are explanations, not excuses. The vast natural wealth of the State has often been a stronger force than the virtue of its people, but in many issues of the past that virtue has triumphed. It did when the people sold the lines of transportation, when they stopped all special legislation, when they made offices elective by themselves instead of by the legislature, and in hundreds of minor matters. The great State evil of the present, appropriations to charities and schools, in which money is squandered and favor and silence purchased, is raising against itself a sentiment which will ultimately prevail. They who write the permanent disgrace of Pennsylvania are premature.

Whether it is a sinner more than any other State may not be known, but the world knows the worst. The bitterness of faction in each of the parties has told every discreditable thing that is true, and much that is not true. The truth is dark enough. At each end of the State is a large city, and in each politics has often been a question of contracts. The prevailing management in one allies itself with the Quaker faction of the Republican party; in the other against it. One of them, and probably both, has carefully studied its lessons in

the Tammany laboratory. They have undertaken to buy some of the voters, to deceive others, and to keep others asleep. Vast sums of money have been spent in securing nominations and elections of members of the legislature, with reference to the senatorial choice, the most of it corruptly. Corporations with tremendous financial concerns at stake have swelled the funds. A gentleman who knows the conditions as well as any one in the State estimates the purchasable material in one legislature of two hundred and fifty-three members to be about fifty. Men of wealth and education, the natural leaders of reform movements, are directors of hospitals and asylums and schools of various grades, and do not take their right places in politics lest they should imperil their worthy institutions. But there are those who believe that it would be better for the State if every one of these charities and schools, with all its inmates, was sunk in the sea, rather than that moral considerations should be made subordinate to mercenary. Again, Pennsylvania is a State of corporations. The highest business talent is involved in their management. Many of them have secured all they need from the State, but they must preserve, they argue, the interests of their stockholders, which are at the mercy of adverse legislative or councilmanic action. A threat of blackmail makes them the silent witnesses, if not the active participants, of the triumph of

iniquity, and deprives good government of their potent leadership. But there are those who would not accept a directorship or hold stock in companies which thrive on the profits of evil doing. *This* may truly be said: That the Commonwealth has a tough fight on its hands against the natural consequences of its own riches, and that, when virtue and honor prevail, as they will in the future, and as they have repeatedly in the past, it will be in the face of a stronger opposition than confronts the party of righteousness in almost any other State. Meantime, the few Quakers left in Pennsylvania are working, almost to a man, for clean politics, and are profoundly skeptical when they are told that the devotion of their ancestors to high ideals of peace and moral purity is responsible for present corruption and selfishness.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA POLITICS.*

The request conveyed to me was that I should read to you a paper on the "Influence of Friends as a Religious Body upon the Government of Pennsylvania." I asked to be excused from this service, partly because it has been many a time treated, and partly because the influences have become so mixed that it is difficult for me to trace them. Very few people now in Pennsylvania can say that their ruling inheritance has come from one section or the other of the country. My own ancestry includes several families of English Quakers who came in with William Penn; a French Huguenot, who founded Strasburg, Lancaster County; a Scotch-Irishman, and a Welsh settler of Haverford. From which of these sources I have inherited special characteristics I do not know, and what is true of me is true of the great majority of the citizens of Pennsylvania. The confusion is made still greater by the influence of one section upon another. Unquestionably in early times the English Quaker and the Scotch-Irish Presbyterian were antipodes in political ideas, in theology and in social questions. One settled the east and the

*An address delivered before the Clisophic Society of Lancaster, Pa., 1904.

other the west of the State, and if bad government is to be the test of racial or denominational influence, it is pretty hard to decide whether Philadelphia or Pittsburg is the worst. The modifying factors working through these two hundred and twenty years have brought us all into the list of Pennsylvanians, and these modifying factors have been geological and geographical rather than racial.

But if I do not speak on the subject assigned, it will form an excellent preface to that which I wish to make the subject of this paper, "The Moral Development of Pennsylvania Politics in the Last One Hundred Years." The leaders of political life in Pennsylvania prior to the Revolution made it the best governed colony in the whole line of those which stretched along the Atlantic coast. The ideas for which it stood were the ideas which have been incorporated into our national government. It is not the dogmatism of New England or the aristocracy of Virginia which we now consider as distinctively American; it is the civil and religious liberty of Pennsylvania. So much is this a part of our political thinking that we are apt to forget how exclusively Pennsylvania stood for these ideas in other times and how she prospered as a result of them. Other principles, the doctrine of peace and arbitration as opposed to warlike settlement of international disputes, the principle of absolute justice and fairness in dealing

with inferior races, we do homage to in stating that they belong to the purer and higher life of the future. Very few will be found to dispute their theoretical correctness, and if peace is not as much a part of our national progress as liberty, there is nothing in our history to indicate that we are not moving towards it. The settlers of Pennsylvania were a hundred years ahead of their time in matters of liberty, and perhaps three hundred in other peculiar foundation ideas.

When Pennsylvania approached the Revolution it was the keystone of the situation. It had grown more rapidly in wealth and material advantages than any other colony, though it was almost the latest settled. Its internal affairs had been managed with greatest wisdom. Its taxes were the lightest; its main city was the largest, the best lighted, best paved and best policed; its hospitals and charitable and penal institutions were the most enlightened and effective. Its free constitution had brought thither the leading thinkers of the time, especially in the realm of science. The best statement from the constitutional point of view of the position of the country was made by John Dickinson; and the selection of the city as the headquarters of the Continental Congress, and afterwards the capital of the United States up to 1800, was not merely a question of geography, but of general fitness.

The controlling influences in Pennsylvania prior to the Revolution were not merely moral men, but they were also progressive men. They understood the conditions of growth, they prepared wisely for the future, and if it is true that Philadelphia is now slow, if she is, as a magazine writer has called her, "corrupt and contented," it is due to influences which have had their origin and development since the Revolution.

But my point to-night is to take up the conditions of the State at this date and to show that there has been no serious deterioration in the years which separate us from the Revolution. The war itself, as wars usually do when they are close at home, did result in loose government. The very preparation and rumor of war began it. In a private letter, written by James Pemberton in 1763, contrasting things with the quiet regime of a dozen years before, he says:

"Vice of all kinds prevails in a lamentable degree; murder, highway robberies, and house-breaking are committed, and the perpetrators have passed undiscovered; the minds of the people are agitated by a great ferment; and the rulers of the people cause them to err; the few in public station who have virtue enough to put the laws in execution have their hands weakened by a mean and mercenary opposition, so that desolation appears almost inevitable."

It is not wise to belittle our present political ills. Pennsylvania has many of them which wise men will not close their eyes to. There may be an immoral autocracy of leadership, though leadership, and frequently autocratic leadership, is essential in any well organized and successful movement, whether political, commercial or moral.

There may be mercenary officials who, in some cases sporadically, in others systematically, are stealing from the public treasuries. The temptations are of such a character, and the opportunities are so great and so veiled, that it would be a matter of wonder if it were not so. There may be a low standard of official conduct which is not essentially mercenary, as when a kindly man votes for an improper incumbent, on the plea that himself or family needs the aid the salary will give.

But the whole tone of public thought will have to be raised many degrees before a community, with universal suffrage in its grasp, will look on public service purely from the point of view of public good. Unselfishness in politics will come when men's hearts are attuned to a purer morality than now exists in the masses anywhere. Love of fame, of power, of distinction, may be one grade higher in the moral scale than love of money, but they are equally selfish as motives for public action.

It is not my purpose to apologize for or to

condemn critically existing political conditions, but very briefly to show that there has been a marked improvement in these conditions through the years which separate us from the Revolutionary War and the times of George Washington.

I believe the contrary opinion is generally entertained. The purity of the Washingtonian age seems to be a maxim taught to children in school, and toward which we sometimes look with sadness when we compare it with our own. The line of Presidents from Washington to the second Adams is apparently to the ordinary American a line of intellectual and moral giants. Jackson, to a certain extent, inaugurated the era of lower grade statesmen since his day, and shared their frailties.

It is not difficult to explain this partial deification of the founders of the Republic. Individually, many of them deserve it. Nothing has come to light to lessen the respect that we should feel for the supreme public services and exalted standards of our first President, and history has so emphasized this fact that his virtues are reflected from the other public characters of his day, and they are credited with something of the same distinguished patriotism. When the idea thus gained from history and biography is compared with the newspaper idea of present politics we note the vast degeneracy.

As a matter of fact, the historians have hardly

dealt fairly by us. In their researches among contemporary letters and papers they have been sadly conscious of deficiencies which they have not deemed it advisable to report. They have seen the same selfishness, the same unfair virulence of partisan spirit, the same willingness to cast their votes for personal reasons of a mercenary sort, which good men so deplore to-day. The honest and fair-minded historian, whatever impression his writings make on his readers, must be an optimist. He must know the evils out of which the State has evolved, and with this knowledge he must have hopes that present ills, however serious, must somehow, some day, be rectified.

The mob government which followed the departure of the British in 1781 is a matter of history. Unquestioned Revolutionary patriots, like Wilson and Mifflin, were besieged in their houses by the wild, riotous people demanding vengeance even of the conservatives. There was not enough of the sort of population which produced the French Revolution, but in a feeble way the Philadelphia Revolution went through the same stages. The voluntary exile of many British sympathizers, who had been the men of property and standing in the country, and the general depreciation of currency and property, had left the balance of power in the hands of an excited populace. These, for a time, overawed the authorities, sending two comparatively innocent men to the gallows, and

made demands for reckless legislation which were almost impossible to resist. In the midst of this excitement, Joseph Reed was made President of the Supreme Executive Council, the Governor of the State. The legislature thought it necessary to celebrate the event in a banquet, and unfortunately for the credit of our country, the caterer's bill is still in existence, having recently been unearthed by Dr. Bolles, a colleague of mine at Haverford, as follows:

The General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania
1st Dec. 1778

To Gifford Dolly, Dr.

	£
To provide for dinner for 270 gents,	500
522 Bottles of Madeira Wine,	1229
116 Large Bowls of punch	348
9 Large Bowls of toddy,	13
6 Large Bowls of sangaree,	18
24 Bottles of port wine,	36
2 Tubs of grog,	36
1 Gallon spirits,	6
96 Wine glasses, (broke)	36
29 Jelly glasses, (broke)	10
9 Desert plates, (broke)	6
11 China plates (broke)	11
2 China dishes, (broke)	10
5 Decanters, (broke)	7
1 Large inkstand, (broke)	6
14 candles,	21

2295

Our Revolutionary Fathers evidently had a convivial time, and the broken ware was a testimony to inebriety then as now. We have our own junketings at public expense, but we must recall that this was in the darkest days of the war, when the soldiers were

starving and freezing, when the finances were utterly disorganized, and when it looked as if the whole cause would be lost for lack of money. One can not but question the self-denying patriotism, or else the self-restraint, of men who would permit such a bill, inflated by the depreciated currency though it was, at public cost.

When the Federal Constitutional Convention had done its work in Philadelphia it was of vast importance that Pennsylvania should ratify it. She was a central and important State, and negative action would probably produce a rejection of the whole instrument, and plunge the country into anarchy. Her legislature was then in session, but just about to adjourn, and it was concluded, as the majority was favorable, to force through a series of resolutions calling a convention before the opposition, which was very strong in the western part of the State, had time to organize. The only way the minority had to defeat this hasty legislation was by absenting itself and breaking the quorum.

The Constitutionals were equal to the emergency, and a mob of men visited the boarding houses of two of the demurring legislators in Philadelphia, and forced them, in rude garb and protesting in no mild language, into the State House on Chestnut street, where the clerk called their names and established a quorum. The resolutions were carried, and

Pennsylvania was the first State, except Delaware, to adopt the Constitution which made us a nation. The others followed, and the beneficial result was reached, but by a stretch of unfairness and illegality which can only be justified as a revolutionary act.

The administration of Washington followed. The play of partisan and personal forces began. A paper of the times declares that "if ever a nation was deceived by a man the American nation was deceived by Washington; if ever a nation was debased by a man the American nation was debased by Washington."

There were press muzzlers in those days, but the editors gloried in libel suits.

The important acts were the adoption of the state debts by the Federal Government and the choice of a location for the capital city. As is well known, the two measures were so associated that by a trade Jefferson threw a few votes for Hamilton's favorite funding measure, and in return the New York statesman found as many northern votes for the Potomac site; and so the southern river, instead of the Delaware, became the site of the District of Columbia.

Both of these bills gave excellent opportunities for making money out of legislation. Had the two senators from Pennsylvania united for the development of the State on the same location, there is good reason to believe that a majority of the congress would

have passed it; but one owned land on the Delaware and the other on the Susquehanna, and the chance slipped by.

The ups and downs of Hamilton's bill were reflected in the prices of state bonds, and legislators did not scruple to use their private knowledge to advance their private fortunes. William Findley was a Representative from Pennsylvania at the time, and he tells of a league of congressmen who had agreed to claim \$500,000 more than Pennsylvania's actual debt, and then destroy all evidences of the transaction, so that the fraud should never be disclosed. His honest protest alone, he says, prevented the consummation of the scheme.

Senator Maclay's Journal gives us many insights into the political condition of the times. He says that Representative Fitzsimmons held back the Tariff Bill till his own ships were in; that Senator Bingham took \$36,000 in counterfeit notes to the United States Treasury and received good money for them, and that a dinner would bring ten votes where public service would bring one, and many other despondent statements.

"Jay," said Gouverneur Morris, at a later date, knocking the ashes out of his pipe, "what a set of scoundrels we had in the Second Congress!"

It is never pleasant to record evil deeds, whether our own or our ancestors. Their patriotic virtue car-

ried them safely over the tendencies which cropped out in such instances as the above. Because these crimes were conceived and perpetrated, and the participants escaped public penalties, the young nation was not submerged in guilt and infamy.

The purpose of mentioning them here is to show the outgrowth of weakness and wickedness in these ancient times, to indicate that the public men of one hundred years ago were of the same stuff as our own. Indeed, the conclusion seems inevitable that had they been confronted with the same fierce temptations which exist to-day, a balance in favor of present virtue would be found. The days of corporations and contractors, seeking vast financial favors of legislative and executive bodies, had not yet arrived. The bribes to which they succumbed were paltry affairs, measured by our standards. With this difference staring us in the face, we cannot see how the days of Washington and Jefferson can show any advantage over the days of Cleveland and Roosevelt.

And yet the nation survived and prospered. She got out of her difficulties with considerable credit. She kept up her standards. She stood for liberty, equality and honesty. She developed new men to meet every new emergency, and placed her corrupt, her incompetent and her selfish politicians, after they had run their little debasing career, in the background of oblivion.

Whether as regards the nation or the State, she did this by a continual fight against evil tendencies, by preaching in church and school the nobility of self-effacing public service, and continually aiding the reformatory forces which seem to exist in human society. When good men do their duty the whole of history shows that there is a trend toward goodness and power in the affairs of men. As our ancestors have triumphed over the serious obliquities of their times, and bequeathed to us a nation and a State where the forces of righteousness are stronger than in their day, so will we do the same. We may not shut our eyes to present evils, but we may combat them with the assurance that we are on the winning side, and, although in human affairs evil-doers do not seem always to reap their just rewards, yet as a net result we are carrying forward the cause of political reform with each decade to a better standard of righteousness.

The improvement has not been uniform. Great evils would entrench themselves in public places, and for a time would be invulnerable. Men would grow discouraged as they would concentrate their attention on these back eddies, and would talk pessimistically about the good old times forever gone. But the forces of good would be gathering, and men's consciences would be rectifying themselves, and the quiet forces underneath would be doing their work; and

finally, in one great cataclysm, the evil would topple over and the stream of progress move triumphantly along. Nothing can check permanently the healthy growth of an educated and liberty-loving democracy. The natural laws of development, the spirit that has dictated upward progress through the Christian centuries, must, overlooking the backward tendencies which are either temporary or local, still continue to place politics on an ever-rising plane of morals.

THE FRIEND IN POLITICS.*

“Meddle not with government; never speak of it; let others say or do as they please. . . . For it is a charge I leave with you and yours, meddle not with the public, neither business nor money, but understand how to avoid it and defend yourselves upon occasion against it. For much knowledge brings sorrow, and much doing, more. Therefore know God, know yourselves; love home, know your own business and mind it, and you have more time and peace than your neighbors. . . . I have said little to you of distributing justice, or being just in power or government, for I should desire you may never be concerned therein, unless it were on your own principles, and then the less the better, unless God requires it of you.”

These are extracts from William Penn's advice to his children, written on the occasion of his leaving England in 1699, on his second visit to America. One cannot help wondering why he wrote advice which he consistently disobeyed, during his whole life, and on which disobedience rested his most prominent claims to fame and usefulness. We might, perhaps, assume that he foresaw the failures of his sons

*An address given before the Haverford Summer School of Religious History, 1904.

in this direction, and that they would exchange his philanthropic aims for mercenary ones, but this supposition is negatived when we remember that he made them his heirs, not only to the proprietorship of his great estate in Pennsylvania, but also to the governorship as well.

To understand the reasons for this advice, we may, perhaps, have some clue when we remember that at this time he was deeply involved in debt, having actually mortgaged his Pennsylvania property to his defrauding steward, Peter Ford, and was endeavoring to cover up the transaction till a better time should come; that he had also, for about a decade, been a suspect during the reign of William III., on account of his friendliness to the exiled Stuart king; that he had been in prison, not only for the cause of truth, but also as a debtor and as a politician, and that these imprisonments had distinctly been the result of his meddling with the government. He evidently felt that his own peace of mind would have been greatly enhanced if he had left these perplexing political questions alone. The advice looks a little like a temporary discouragement of a strong and conscientious man, the glow of whose youthful enthusiasm had worn away, and the evident fruits of whose enlightened experiment in government had not been conspicuous. It was a time of temporary depression, when he was in the thick of the storm, receiving all

its buffetings, and not yet beginning to recognize its beneficent fruits. His splendid patrimony was all but gone; his colonists, many of whom he had rescued from English jails, seemed to be ungrateful; his far-seeing ideas about government were not being accepted, but instead there was haggling over little privileges which he deemed unworthy of their serious consideration; and, on the other side, there was the nagging of the British court, which used the Quaker objections to war and oaths as a means for insuring the failure of the exalted attempt. Perhaps it was some such considerations as these which induced Penn to give this advice, so contrary to his general train of thought and expression, and absolutely opposed to his life-long example.

Friends had not shown any dislike or inaptitude for government. Wherever their numbers were considerable, and the laws gave them any opportunity, they had taken their full share of the work. In Rhode Island, in 1672, and adjoining years, the governor, deputy-governor and the magistrates were all chosen from among them, and the whole management of the colony was in their hands, and William Codrington was an influential man for a long time. In North Carolina, about 1686, John Archdale was the governor, and the Quakers were the prominent element of its politics. As Bancroft says: "It was settled by the freest of the free, by men to whom the

restrictions of other colonies were too severe, and the settlers were genial in their tempers, of serene mind, enemies to violence and bloodshed, and the spirit of humanity retained its influence in the paradise of Quakers." New Jersey, too, was a Quaker commonwealth, and when an effort was made to secure administration of justice by means of oaths, so universal was Quaker sentiment that the courts were practically closed. All the men capable of administering the affairs positively refused to take any part, and this condition lasted for years.

But it was, of course, in Pennsylvania that the Quakers had their full swing in politics. They evidently meant to take it. It was just as serious a matter as their religion or their business. During early years, nearly all the men prominent in state affairs were ministers of the gospel, and they divided daily their state and church work so that they would not conflict with each other. Here is a minute of 1685, of Philadelphia Monthly Meeting: "John Eckley and James Claypoole are appointed by this Meeting to request the magistrates of the county that they will please to keep their court on the first 5th day of every month, which, if they please to grant, then the weekly meeting, which hath hitherto been on the 5th day, shall be on the 4th day, that so the court and the meeting may not be on the same day."

The same men were magistrates and ministers, and they had to arrange a program which would permit both forms of activity to be carried on. And so these "Friends of God," as they called themselves, became expert politicians, and, like politicians, when they ran out of questions of importance, stirred up their minds on the subject of imaginary wrongs, and raised a tempest over little trifles. For thirty years after the settlement Pennsylvania politics cannot be considered essentially peaceful, and were not what one would expect of a Quaker attempt in government. There was not overmuch opposition to their control (except temporarily when adverse deputy governors happened to be on hand), and so they took the occasion to form political parties among themselves and to attack each other with quite as much vigor as we see in present days. They had never had any chance to meddle with government in England, and they were veritable tyros in the art. But out of their little differences grew up the best governed and the most peaceful and contented commonwealth in the new country.

They could be sufficiently vigorous when the occasion demanded. Thomas Lloyd, Oxford scholar and Quaker minister though he was, could be a most strenuous partisan. When Governor Blackwell, who was an honest but tactless man, and who got on the wrong side of the Quaker politicians of the day, tried to force

his measures, he met with a resistance which finally drove him from his position, and it was not always a quiet or a passive one.

Thomas Lloyd died at an early age, worn out with the responsibility and turmoil of managing State and Church in the Quaker colony, and one effect of his death was to bring into prominence his namesake, but not relative, that first Pennsylvania "boss," David Lloyd. David marshaled the Quaker host against Penn and Logan and their supposed aristocratic tendencies. They made mistakes, of which he was quick to take advantage. He was shrewd and resourceful, working on the prejudices and convictions of the Friends, and building up the party, which by fair means, and sometimes by foul, made infinite trouble in the little community. He absolutely controlled the legislature. Ultimately they threw him overboard and returned to their allegiance, and, after he had sulked a half a dozen years in the country, made him Chief Justice, a position where his great abilities could exhibit themselves, and where his offensive partisanship had no room for exercise. It is no wonder that Penn urged them in a word of his own coinage: "Be not so *governmentish*."

Now the rest of the acts of these early Quaker politicians and their quarrels, are they not written in the colonial records of the Province of Pennsylvania, by

the pen of that veracious old chronicler, William Markham?

About 1710 they got together. Other people were coming in, and they could not well afford to differ among themselves. David Lloyd was deposed from the leadership. Logan became the chief man of the Province, and, as the agent of the Penn family, he ruled it wisely and well for forty years. During this time a great Quaker political machine was built up. It was probably scrupulously honest, but wonderfully effective. The Penn family in England had left the Friendly fold, and appointed governors who frequently sided with the non-Quaker partisans, but the Friends kept their hold on the provincial legislature. Sometimes it was unanimously Friendly, and at no time was there more than a small minority of opponents, and yet the Friends were now in a minority of the total population. Some of their acts verged on the methods of the sharp politician. For instance, they allowed the Quaker counties more than their share of representatives, not by direct edict, but by declining to admit a proportionate share from the new counties as they developed. But, on the whole, their politics will bear inspection. They held the German vote, which enabled them to triumph. They stood fast for personal liberty and opposition to proprietary pretensions, which gave them the support of the lib-

erty-loving people of the colony. They picked their ablest men to represent them in the Assembly, and kept them there year after year.

One of their leaders was John Kinsey, who, during the later years of his life, held at the same time the position of Speaker of the Assembly, Chief Justice of the Colony, and Clerk of the Yearly Meeting. Another was his successor as Speaker, Isaac Norris the second, the son of the prominent minister and sagacious advisor of Penn of the same name, who led the majority in the Assembly for nearly thirty years. He is the man to whom the inscription on the Liberty Bell is due, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." It was he who became famous for his indignant refusal to accept a seductive proposition of the governor. "No man shall ever stand on my grave and say, 'Curse him, here lies he who betrayed the liberty of his country.' "

The country Friends marshaled themselves under George Ashbridge, whose shed, which he had constructed for his horse and carriage at the old Goshen Meeting House, was, until recently, still standing, with doors both front and back, so that he could drive through, for, he said, he "never liked to back out of anything." When, after he had been some dozen years in the position, there came the time when the demands of the Indian war induced the resignation of the Quaker members, he applied his principle of

not backing out to a practical purpose, when he refused to accede to the wishes of his ecclesiastical superiors to withdraw and apologize, and they reported sadly to the Monthly Meeting: "He do not feel himself culpable." So he remained both in the Assembly and in the meeting for thirty years, till his death, just on the eve of the Revolutionary War.

Such were the leaders the Quaker machine had. They were continually meddling with politics, and their people loved to have it so. They revered the memory of William Penn, and preferred the example of his whole life to the advice given in a temporary condition of pessimism. The Indian wars of 1756 shook their hold on power by their own renunciation of position. Had they been mere politicians, they would have trimmed before the storm. Had they been rather stronger Quakers, they might have held on to power, without any trimming, a while longer. About this time began to grow up in the Quaker mind the mystical development which had never been far below the surface. Exhortations began to be heard to eschew worldly activity and develop the sanctified spirit which throve in the silence of the flesh. The Revolutionary war put the climax on this teaching. In the first place, the active public spirited men of the Society took strenuous part on the American side and were disowned. The general feeling that the Quakers were British sympathizers and

had opposed the Revolution, lost them any opportunity to recover the political hold which they had held prior to 1756. And so the mystic triumphed, and with individual exceptions, more numerous a hundred years ago than now, the Quaker withdrew from politics. He filled up his share of public activities in developing prisons and hospitals and in doing works of charity, in fighting slavery and drunkenness and oaths and war, within and without his own ranks, and in having a general oversight from a separate height of observation, over the rights and wrongs of the nation. But the Quaker vote became a negligible quantity, and no public man received it because he happened to be a member of their body. I have heard it said, though I have not seen it, that there was a query in New York Yearly Meeting: "Are Friends clear of holding positions of profit and honor under the government?" So the revolution from the days of Thomas and David Lloyd, James Logan, Isaac Norris, John Kinsey and George Ashbridge has been brought about.

But taking facts as they are, what is our duty now? We cannot simply resolve to retake the mantle which our fathers have cast down. We cannot say among ourselves, "Go to! I will be Speaker of the Assembly, or Chief Justice of the State, or Senator of the United States, or President." Something more than our consent to hold office is evidently needed. Poli-

tical conditions have absolutely changed in the last century, and, if we are to have anything like the legitimate influence which it is not only our privilege, but our duty, to exert, it is necessary to adapt ourselves to the new conditions with a full comprehension of their meaning and methods. It is idle to declaim against machines in politics. They have got there, as they have got into industry, business, philanthropy and church work, in response to the undeniable demand of the age for efficiency. Our Quaker ancestors of pre-Revolutionary days did not work without co-operation, and the political parties of the present time have simply improved and developed that co-operation into a successful organization. A man may glory in being an "Independent," outside of all machines, but his efforts under such circumstances will be comparatively futile. He must take his place with his fellow believers, and do the work to which he is assigned as thoroughly and obediently as if he were employed in a factory or bank. Moreover, he must, as in these cases, begin at the bottom, and prove his utility as he goes along, receiving promotion as he deserves it. This does not mean that he must sacrifice his convictions or violate his conscience. Here, of course, there comes an end to obedience and subordination, and it is doubtless true that a man with a conscience will, under certain conditions, be less valuable to the organization, and have fewer chances for personal pro-

motion, than the man without it. On the other hand, under other conditions, conscience becomes a valuable asset.

If you ask the practical significance of all this, come with me to the Republican Primary Convention, which nominates the officials of a nearby township. You will find, crowded in a little room, dense with smoke of mixed grades of tobacco, some two hundred voters, of all colors and ranks in life and variations of purpose and motive. The active office seeker is bustling around among them, shaking hands cordially with his neighbors, whom he may have discarded many times before, promoting sociability and donating cigars. A man, with just enough liquor aboard to be funny, is the center of an admiring group of young fellows, who laugh loudly at his jokes of greater or less vulgarity. The wealthy merchant whose residence is in this suburb jostles against his coachman or gardener, and the college professor occupies a seat in close proximity to the recent importation from Virginia or Italy. Is this any place for a minister of the Society of Friends? The meeting is called to order, and immediately the better and more unselfish part of the community asserts itself. Nominations are made of men who will fill more or less worthily the positions of School Director, Road Supervisor, Township Auditor or Tax Collector. It is remembered that another convention is being held by

the opposing party, that another set of candidates will go before the public, and that in local matters of this sort very little attention is paid to party lines. So a man of doubtful antecedents or of objectionable policy is generally excluded, and when the complete ticket is read out, as the result of a primitive form of voting, in which the hat takes the place of the ballot box, a reputable list of candidates has usually been worked out by the machinery of the meeting.

During the operations, various questions may arise. "Shall the Convention be held next year in the saloon or in the school house?" "Is a certain policy of road-building better than another?" "Is it wise to increase the school accommodations, in view of the financial condition of the township?" and plenty more, which are argued then and there by a process which accomplishes the result, if not always strictly parliamentary. Here, evidently, is a plastic mass of humanity, open to influences for good or evil.

Here is the unit of political life, and there are thousands of other such units, side by side, covering the whole country from one end to another. Is there nothing for the conscientious Friend to do under these conditions? Can he not take his full active part in such a meeting as this, without any loss of dignity or self-respect or honesty of purpose, and do something to bring his particular unit into a condition of honesty and in accord with better standards of govern-

ment? It is the beginning of political work, and having excluded himself through all these years from political effort, he must now begin at the beginning; work around his own door step; improve the politics of his township or ward; give himself a standing among his neighbors, and show himself worthy of larger influence and position. By and by, perhaps, he may extend his operations into the county organization, and when he has compassed the machinery of this, and has shown that he possesses the qualities essential to success and usefulness, his field of labor may extend itself to the State, and by and by—who knows?—some exalted position may ask him to occupy itself.

Does this career sound rather uninviting? Does it seem as if there was a great deal of thankless detail and time-taking drudgery to be gone through before the rewards come? If the purpose is simply political reward, it will not pay. The Friend whose desires are purely selfish had better stay out of active politics. I am not speaking for him. I am speaking for the man who has some sense of duty; and while I doubt not that there are perhaps a half dozen people in this audience who would accept the United States Senatorship if it were brought them on a silver plate, I trust also there is a still greater number who want to do something for the State, not because it will bring them honor and distinction, but because they

have the obligation, because the responsibilities of citizenship have been placed upon them, and because the privileges of citizenship are accorded to them daily.

I do not know why it is that Friends in high public positions are more numerous in England than in America,—whether it is because conditions are different over there, the machinery less exacting, or that hereditary and social distinction is more sought as a qualification for political places. I do not believe that under the conditions which exist in Pennsylvania at the present time, the most exalted qualifications and the most perfect preparation will induce managers of either political party to seek for high preferment men outside their own ranks of workers. Were the two parties evenly divided, such might be the case; but one of them can elect almost any reasonably reputable man by presenting him to the public, and the other has no chance to elect any one at all.

So, my friends, you and I are not likely to be asked to occupy a high official station; and looking at the matter with perfect fairness, we could hardly complain that we are not. For we have spent the most of our lives in fighting against the tendency towards organization, and complaining that the ideals are continually lowering, and perhaps down in the bottom of our hearts feeling that the whole thing is on a plane to which we will never descend. While we are in this

attitude of mind, it is not likely that we shall be asked to receive rewards for which others have been doing all the work. But if we are willing to attach ourselves to the organization with which we feel most in unity, do its unpleasant though not dishonest work, tactfully adapt ourselves to the demands which will inevitably be made upon us, not holding ourselves aloof from active participation in the necessary machinery of politics, doing our local work first, and extending our operations as opportunity offers, studying more profoundly than the average politician the demands of the situation and the trend of public thought, with a fundamental basis of honest conviction from which we cannot go astray, but holding our prejudices in abeyance until we feel our grasp on the situation and our power to control it; then we shall begin to hear of Quaker members of Congress, and Governors of States, and then we shall begin also to appreciate that the machine is not necessarily and always a bad machine, that it can be influenced perennially and powerfully toward the elimination of evil and the encouragement of high ideals.

There may be—and I suppose there are—certain wards in the city of Philadelphia where such a policy as this would be unavailing, where conditions are such that honest effort would seem to have no influence at all. But this certainly is not true in the country dis-

tricts, nor in the great bulk of city wards. I do not mean that anywhere the man would be successful right away. He might fail a hundred times, but all the time his power is growing and his influence being exerted. He is making friends for his cause, and by and by there is a party formed which must be taken into account, and which grows in geometrical ratio. A few intelligent and honest people often hold the balance of power, and can afford to insist on measures which in the beginning would seem to be entirely out of reach.

It is instructive to notice the way reforms are secured in American politics. A long and discouraging process of quiet work always precedes any prominent change for the better. He who says that the times are not propitious, or that the task is too difficult, and so gives it up, does not read the past aright. Does any one think that, had it not been for the labors of Woolman, the sufferings of Garrison, and the writings of Whittier, Abraham Lincoln would ever have issued the Emancipation Proclamation of 1862? Any one who has worked in an institution has seen this process in a small way. Some inveterate traditional abuse has taken hold of the minds of the residents. The first suggestion of a change is received with scoffing, but if it is right and reasonable every succeeding suggestion gains atten-

tion, and finally converts begin to come, and after awhile the old abuse is taken away by some sudden and unexpected movement.

So it is with the nation at large. Work goes quietly on. The advocates at first are said to be fanatics, are exciting unnecessary opposition, are enemies of the cause which they wish to foster; but if the purpose is a good one, other people who are not fanatics begin to see the righteousness of it. They do not say very much; they go on with their every-day life, but their minds are getting prepared for the change, and in the fullness of time, often without a warning, the whole nation wakes up to the fact that the fanatics were advocating that which they all believe, and the thing is done. Napoleon used to say that though a battle might last a whole day, there were always just ten minutes in which it was either won or lost, and that the secret of the success of the great general was to know how to utilize these ten minutes. So this initial preparation, this incipency of the reform movement, has its culmination in a great and unexpected crisis, when a blow may be struck for freedom or righteousness just at the right moment, because that right moment is a development of all the agencies that have gone before it.

This is the answer to the pessimism which seizes many people. They see evil apparently growing and

flourishing, and getting more and more intrenched in law and custom. At the present time we cannot shut our eyes to the disgraceful state of municipal government in this country, and while, in taking a large view of the situation, we cannot but admit that our government, as a whole, is purer, our people better and happier, and the cause of good more potent than a hundred years ago, still, if we center our minds on this one feature, there is, in certain particulars, gross deterioration. Is this to continue? Judged by the recent past alone, it may; and, if the leaders of it are wise enough to make the descent easy and gradual, without arousing much fear of danger, it may last for a long time. But quietly, underneath this iceberg of corruption, the warm waves of Christian progress are doing their work, and some day it will topple over.

From this point of view, no good efforts are ever wasted. This, I know, is a truism which people accept because they are told to, but which they cannot believe except by faith. Nevertheless, I think I may say that it is true. Our skepticism results from the fact that we expect immediate results and are not willing to abide the process of nature. Every good act for a good cause unquestionably makes some conversion to it, and in the fullness of time the crisis comes, and the summation of all these good tenden-

cies is evident in one great cataclysm. He who works for an honest and efficient school director in the humblest district of this great land, whether he succeeds in his immediate object or not, is aiding in the triumph of virtue and goodness. His work, with others', makes possible emancipation proclamations from all sorts of evil.

We Friends are apt to consider that the testimonies and moral protests which we make are good for ourselves rather than for the world at large. One of our traditional queries in Philadelphia reads, "Do you bear a faithful testimony against oaths, military training, fraudulent transactions and lotteries?" And if none of our members have been frankly engaged in these matters, we answer in the affirmative, and congratulate ourselves on our advanced position. But if we believe such customs are an antithesis of Christian teaching, they are bad for the world at large, and not for ourselves only. If oaths are forbidden by New Testament morality, then this whole nation is daily suffering, because it employs them. If the military spirit and the Christian spirit are working in different directions, then the prominence of the military spirit is a great national evil. If the common business transactions of a country are permeated by a standard which permits unfair and untruthful opera-

tions in ordinary trade, then the country is suffering, no matter how clear we ourselves may be. And if certain slot machines, and other contrivances for taking the pennies of boys, are really lotteries in disguise, then the fact that we have never touched lotteries in our whole denominational history does not settle the question for us. We are hardly bearing faithful testimony against these matters by simply abstaining from them. It becomes part of our mission to make ourselves heard in an emphatic voice against them, as they affect others besides ourselves. Part of this protest will be simply moral and educative, and I do not say that we are not doing our duty in these respects, at least in part. But a great many of these influences also have to be made by legislation, and the executive enforcement of laws already made; and here comes in the field of politics. Here, also, is the suggestion of usefulness for Friends in this particular. Will not the demand of our query that we bear a faithful testimony, insist upon definite and persistent political action? Has it not been true that we have done quite as much as is good for us in the way of eulogizing the foresight and clear perceptions and righteous efforts of our fathers of the past and of the corporate action of the Society of Friends, and have done entirely too little in the way of nerv-

ing ourselves up to the path of self-denial and persistent filling of the line of duty by wise participation in every-day politics?

"These are my principles," says the politician at the conclusion of an eloquent address to his constituents, in which he has expressed the most exalted doctrines of political morality, "these are my principles, but if they don't suit you, I can change them." "These are my principles," says the honest man, who believes most profoundly that principles are unchangeable, "and I will not abate one jot or tittle of them, no, not to save my life." Between the two there seems to be a great gulf fixed. I do not think, however, that it is impassable, but rather that its passage is the great problem of modern American political life. He is, of course, making a great mistake who shifts his principles to suit the views of anyone. He commits not only an immoral act, but an inexpedient one. For if there is any lesson which the long pages of history teach us, it is that the right is the expedient. It would have been a plausible thing if a Christian martyr, being led out to the stake, had said, "My life can do more for the cause than my death; I can swallow my scruples this one time, and then go on and spread my religion through many decades." It would have been plausible, I say, but it would have been, as everyone now sees, a fatal error.

His death for that little principle was not merely the right thing to do, but it was also, for the sake of the cause, a politic thing to do. Many a man has stood straight for that which he knew to be right, alone and surrounded by enemies, and without yielding a single conviction, has seen the triumph in his own day. Many another man, under similar circumstances, has never seen the triumph at all, but his children, after many generations, have appreciated that he did the wisest thing possible. Utilitarianism is a catching theory, and in its higher reaches as a theory I do not propose to question it now, but it is refuge of the coward and the opportunist, and is self-condemned.

It is difficult to define the moral law, and perhaps still more difficult to apply it; but that there is a law, graven in the very constitution of man, expressed in his sacred writings, and almost self-evident in its elementary statements, cannot well be denied. It is as inexorable as the law of gravitation, and demands obedience more sternly and implicitly than any tyrant's decree; its penalties cannot be evaded, and its rewards come whether we seek them or not; it governs the development of mankind as individuals and as society; he who obeys it is in line with the forces which are advancing humanity, and he who opposes it lies athwart their path. If we only knew this law in perfection, human duty would be deter-

mined. We get as close to it as we can. These things we call principles and convictions are our interpretations of its behests. We cannot lay them aside with safety to ourselves, and the backbone of all our thinking and doing, if honest, must reside in them. The politician whose backbone is of cartilage, may bend and turn them to suit his whims or present notions of advancement, but the man with a conscience will stand by them, let them lead him to promotion, or contempt; to life, or death.

But the mistake we most often make is that we place in this list of unchangeable convictions a lot of prejudices and preferences, and then make stubbornness take the place of devotion to duty. We hold these preferences so ungraciously that we drive others from their support, and then imagine that we are martyrs to a high principle. It is a rare thing to find an honest man who is also adaptable, who knows where to draw the line between conviction and method, and while holding stringently to the one, yields the other to the exigencies of the practical question. Some men can do it. Whether you approve or not of the principles of government of President Roosevelt, I think it will be admitted that his life has been consistent in its advocacy of that which he has believed, and yet he has always worked with an organization as a loyal part of its machinery, has

impressed it with his personality, and influenced it in the line of his beliefs. While faithful to his convictions, he has been a political success. And I take it that many a thinking man in the country has been induced by his example to believe in the possibility of a politician whose principles are not at the beck and call of his constituents, and yet whose tact and personal power make him *persona grata* to the great mass of his fellow-citizens, to whose prejudices and weaknesses he may defer.

Such possibilities seem to lie in the path of anyone on a larger or smaller scale, provided he has the qualities which will bring success. If so, it ought to be quite as much a matter of duty for him to take the place to which his neighbors call him in political convention or caucus as to attend his yearly meeting, or reform the morals of his delinquent associates.

There are a great many utilitarians who do not know it. Ninety-five per cent. of the arguments for or against any institution involving ethical questions are based on the plea that good results make a good cause, and that certain practices are essential to civilization as it is constituted. I admit that the line of argument which Friends have employed on the subject of war, if consistently applied in other directions, would lead them into deep and difficult places. I do not propose to try to extricate

them. Neither am I now apologizing for their fundamental line of thought as expressed by Dymond and as practiced by George Fox. I simply am stating what seems to me to have always been their position on matters as they have come up. I know, too, that a man like John Bright, who had to come into contact with these questions in a very practical way, would not stand exactly with Jonathan Dymond. They are more easily established in the study, by a man who keeps himself separated from worldly activities, than they are in the field of practical politics or active business. And yet, I apprehend, we are going to hold to them, and have so soaked our minds with the theory of an uncompromising morality that we are not likely to get away from it. I am not urging that we should, and, though I see the difficulties of its application, still I believe in it. All that I claim is that we should keep it within the limitations of moral questions, and not permit that uncompromising and unyielding spirit to enter into the realm where tact must be the rule, and where compromises and exchanges, and the spirit which yields something to get more, are the fundamental necessities.

It is to me a matter of vast importance that this double duty should be impressed especially upon our younger Friends. A new generation is going out into the world, different from any that have preceded

it. Friends can never more be that exclusive body which they have been in the past, shutting themselves off from activities which involve temptation, and confining their exertions to charitable and philanthropic work, and to other efforts which do not touch adversely their convictions. We cannot be in the future what we have been in the past, and yet we do not want to lose the old type. Nor is it necessary that it should be lost in its essential particulars. If faithfulness to convictions is adhered to under all circumstances, there will still be enough discipline in life to refine and purify the spirits and make the morals and character strong and virile. It is not a change of type that we need, but a change of objects for which we are willing to work earnestly and efficiently. And a decay of character will come not as the result of taking up new fields of activity, but as the result of shirking any field of activity, in which it is right for us to enter, because of dangers and difficulties in the way.

This all refers to practical politics; but in the field of theoretical politics Friends ought to find a work equally useful, and perhaps more congenial. I do not know that of recent times they have ever seriously occupied it. There are a number of young men now engaged in the study of political science, who may prove themselves to be worthy successors of

William Penn. There are those who claim that theory and practice at the present time in this subject have no relation to each other, but they are likely to prove as wrong as were the old herb doctors, who decried the science of medicine, or the so-called "practical" engineers who refuse to have anything to do with mathematics. In the long run, practice will be governed by theory, and it is of great importance that this theory should be elaborated by men who are competent to investigate its laws and take account of its conditions.

There therefore ought to be such a thing as a Quaker theory of government. It was not merely the personality of William Penn which gave to his colony its fundamentals of peace and liberty and justice to the natives. These principles came from his theology. The beginning of them was with George Fox and not with William Penn, though the founder of Quakerism probably was not well enough educated to see the trend of his teaching in political directions. It could not be that a man, who made as his cornerstone the doctrine of divine guidance of the individual, could create other than a commonwealth devoted to civil and religious liberty. A man who was willing to go to jail indefinitely rather than disobey the scruple with regard to his hat, would also develop as a political principle obedience to a duty which demanded peace even at a sacrifice of

what seemed common-sense in government. I do not know that this necessary connection between Quaker theology and Quaker principles of government, as illustrated by Penn's experiment, has ever been fully elaborated. Indeed, a recent biographer of Penn concludes his book by the statement, "Sometimes he was a great statesman, and other times he was a great Quaker, but he was never both at the same time." I think he has entirely mistaken the fundamental conceptions of Penn's philosophy. To me it seems that his statesmanship was a direct product of his Quakerism. While, so far as I know, he never seriously attempted the task of proving the connection, yet to a certain extent, unconsciously perhaps, the development from one to the other went on in his own mind. The difference between New England and Pennsylvania in the seventeenth century is simply the difference between Calvinism and Quakerism applied to government. And if, after a control of three-quarters of a century, the Quaker experiment seemed partially to fail, it was largely due to the fact, if I can understand the conditions, that Friends ceased to grasp these fundamental relations. They had no institutions of learning which developed political scholarship of a high grade. They were not philosophers, and they lost the grip on affairs which the Oxford education of Penn and Lloyd enabled them to take at

first. They became, to a large extent, opportunists, or rather, they placed in two water-tight sections their religion and their politics, developing the first along the line of conviction, and the other along the line of opportunity.

The race of political philosophers seemed to become extinct with the first generation; if we can reproduce it in this, it would be a most interesting and hopeful development. Plato's "Republic" and More's "Utopia" constitute attempts to build states on the basis of Greek philosophy and Renaissance Christianity, respectively. Could we have a new Utopia, written by some one who was permeated with the spirit of George Fox, full also of modern philosophy, and a knowledge of all that history can teach of the development of institutions and the growth of political ideas of the last three centuries? Here, it seems to me, is a great field for some of our students. Even should they not bring to it the powers of a Plato or a More, any attempt would be a beginning in a line of indefinite possibilities.

Herbert Spencer says that good conduct must always be based on right theory, and I do not know any more valuable Quaker contribution to our country's government at the present time than would be an analysis of the situation as it exists, by a Friendly philosopher, who could tell *a priori* the right course

for our government to pursue in all matters which touch, however remotely, the field of morals.

But some one asks, "What is the use? Quaker scruples can never be applied to government. You cannot carry on practical affairs on the basis of the pure morality of Christianity. Things must be made right because they work, and not because they are in accord with sound theory. It is thus that civilization has been developed, and any attempt to work it otherwise is simply a Tolstoyan and futile effort."

Much of this we shall have to grant. Penn's experiment broke down in the face of conditions for which he was not responsible, but which, nevertheless, have not ceased to exist. To his doctrine of liberty the nation moved up in less than a century, and the Declaration of Independence was simply the assertion of Penn's position, and the negative of the New England statement and practice. But peace, as he would have it, has not yet come, and if any man would arbitrarily impose a pure standard upon our nation, there would be another Quaker Experiment, which would end in seeming disaster. So also the abolition of the detective system, with all its manifold iniquities, from the administration of justice, would seem like a breakdown of all our courts, with their many beneficent features. Business also, in the minds of many, as at present organized, cannot be

carried on in accord with the principles of a pure morality.

With the vast preponderance of evil thinking and low-motived men in the world, some adaptation to conditions seems to be necessary. The mathematician computes the strain on the bridge; knowing the resisting strength of iron, he determines just the amount that is necessary in each separate piece to carry the load. But the iron is full of flaws, the load is variable, hurricanes arise unexpectedly, and nature seems to make war with theory at every point. And yet the theory is right as a basis, and the bridge is built, having due regard, of course, to modifying conditions, but also governed by the mathematics of the study room.

Just in the same way a well-considered and properly buttressed theory of government, well thought out by a Quaker philosopher, would have to be modified by adaptation to existing circumstances, but it would be, at the same time, a constant beacon light toward which the practical politicians would find themselves impelled to steer, perhaps for generations to come, as they managed the affairs of the State.

A COLONIAL PEACE CONTROVERSY.*

The defeat of that able, and, in many respects, useful Quaker demagogue, David Lloyd, in 1710, by what we would now call a "tidal wave," brought an era of internal peace and prosperity to the Colony of Pennsylvania. The year later, in response to a demand from the English crown for an appropriation in aid of the war with France, the Assembly voted two thousand pounds "for the king's use," Isaac Norris, a minister of high standing, explaining, "We did not see it to be inconsistent with our principles to give the Queen money, notwithstanding what use she might put it to, that being not our part, but hers." Fortunately for the Quaker experiment, other demands of this nature did not soon follow. But this precedent was used in 1740 and in the fifteen years following, until the custom was so loaded up that it fell of its own weight. The well-considered arrangements of James Logan and his friends preserved not only peace, but friendship with the Indians. The broad principles of freedom on which the colony was founded made it an attractive place for the persecuted and liberty-loving people of Europe. The great agricultural resources and the intense desire for

*An address given before the Friends' Historical Society, 1905.

peace especially drew the Palatines, as the dwellers in the Rhine Valley were then called. The government was most economically administered, the total expenses being a mere trifle. Gold and silver were drained from the colony to pay the European bills of a rapidly-growing population, but their places as circulating mediums were supplied by an ingenious system of paper money, issued by the government on the credit of land and plate mortgaged by individuals to redeem it. This was done sparingly and judiciously, and the paper money of Pennsylvania, alone among the colonies, never depreciated.

The public records of these golden days are too quiet to be interesting. They deal with matters of very trifling import, and justify the saying, "Happy is the people whose annals are blank in history." The Friends, who by this time were in the minority of the population, still retained, through the aid of the Germans and the respect of all classes, a preponderating, and, at times, unopposed influence in the popular legislature. The idea that there was any incompatibility between Quakerism and politics had not gained foothold. On the contrary, they felt the responsibility of a great trust committed to them and looked upon it as a part of their religious duties. While they carefully separated church and state, and, so far as can be ascertained, never allowed political dis-

cussions in their meetings, yet the two could not fail to influence each other, as, for instance, the text of a minute of the yearly meeting became the text of a preamble to a statute a few years later. Nothing occurred, however, in these peaceful days, for a quarter of a century, to test their principles. They had come to an understanding on the question of oaths, which, while it cannot be considered to be perfectly satisfactory, exists to this day. They had repudiated the laws established by William Penn on the subject of capital punishment which confined that penalty to the crime of murder only, and had adopted the English law of the time, which made it cover a dozen or more offenses,—a decision which came back to trouble them in later days, but which now seemed generally satisfactory. So far as we know, there was no protest against it, either by legislature or meeting, up to the Revolution, and it was left for the anti-Quaker government of that time, under the lead of Franklin, to re-enact Penn's statute. They were in the minority in the city of Philadelphia, but the three great counties, Chester, Philadelphia and Bucks, were absolutely in their control; for the German immigrants, though in great numbers, did not remain among them, but pressed towards the frontier, and the Scotch-Irish, who were just beginning their great migration, moved still further to the westward. Meeting houses

and school houses dotted the three Quaker counties at distances of a few miles, but little in the way of higher education disturbed the evenness of the lives of these farmers, and yet every one of them could read and write. The general sanity of their beliefs and the liberality of their opinions, to which they had been committed by the first generation of Friends, preserved them to a large degree in the sweet reasonableness of temper which made their uneventful lives models of simplicity and sincerity. And yet among them, as the minutes of the monthly meetings abundantly show, there were individual cases of gross immorality. On the whole, however, it is questionable whether the history of the world has seen an illustration of democratic simplicity and unselfish devotion to intelligent principles modelling so large a population as existed in the province of Pennsylvania, from 1712 to 1739.

During the latter years of this period, Andrew Hamilton had been Speaker of the Assembly, and practically leader of the colony. He was a lawyer of great repute, the originator and architect of the State House, begun during his administration, and, though not a Friend, had their entire confidence. He had just resigned his Speakership, and in so doing had spoken of the vast, unexampled growth of population and wealth in the colony, and the perfect peace which

existed, not only between the colonists and all outside bodies, but among themselves, which he rightly attributed not to their fertile lands, or their great rivers, or their geographical location, but to the constitution and principles of William Penn.

His successor as Speaker of the Assembly was John Kinsey, scarcely less conspicuous as a lawyer, equally respected as a man, and, unlike his predecessor, so identified with Friends in principles and membership, that for twenty years he was clerk of the yearly meeting. In 1742 he was also made Chief Justice of the State, and these three positions he filled until his death in 1750.

As John Kinsey was an important character in the account which follows, a few words as to his life may be inserted. He was born in 1693, a descendant of one of the little band of Friends who settled in Burlington, in 1677. He studied law and practiced in New Jersey, and almost immediately became a member of the Assembly, and later Speaker of that body. In 1725 he appeared in Philadelphia before Governor Keith in the course of his profession, with his hat on. The Governor ordered it removed by force. This created such an excitement, that the official wisely apologized, and ever after, in provincial times, Quaker lawyers considered they had the right to wear their hats in court. He moved to Phila-

delphia in 1730, and was immediately elected to the legislature, and at the same time chosen as clerk of the yearly meeting. The records of the meeting for the twenty years following are full of John Kinsey's work. His name was scarcely ever absent from any important committee. The literary work of Friends of this time, including the London Epistles, the collection of minutes for the new discipline, the epistles to subordinate meetings, was very largely done by him. During most of the time he was engaged in gathering materials for writing a history of the early days of the province, which material afterwards passed over into the hands of Samuel Smith. He was the medium through whom the decisions of the meeting were conveyed to the public, as, note for instance, the following minute of 1738:

“John Kinsey was ordered to draw an advertisement to be printed in the newspapers of Philadelphia, in order to inform all whom it may concern that the book lately published by Benjamin Lay was not published by approbation of Friends; that he is not in unity with us, and that his book contains false charges as well against particular persons of our Society as against Friends in general.”

He died suddenly in 1750, in the midst of his useful career, of an apoplectic stroke, at the age of fifty-

seven. In the "Pennsylvania Gazette" of May 17th of that year appeared the following notice (and such things occurred very sparingly in the newspapers of the day); written, in all probability, by Benjamin Franklin:

"Friday last died suddenly at Burlington, in New Jersey, the Honorable John Kinsey, Esquire, Chief Justice of the Province and Speaker of the General Assembly. His long experience and great ability in the management of public affairs, his skill in the laws, and his unblemished integrity as a Judge, made his life a very valuable and useful one. His death is, therefore, justly lamented as a general loss."

From the point of view of a Friend, John Smith speaks of him: -

"The loss of this great and good man occasions a general lamentation and to present appearances is irreparable."

About the same time that John Kinsey took up the Speakership, George Thomas was made Lieutenant-Governor under the Penns. He knew very little about the character of the people whom he came from the West Indies to govern, but he was a man of ability and resources. If he had been appointed a few years earlier in the times of peace he might have quietly adjusted himself to the conditions; but, unfortunately, Spain and England, as a result of differ-

ences centering in the West Indies, concluded to have a war, and Thomas was keen to support his royal master. The two men, Kinsey and Thomas, were pitted against each other as the leaders of the contest which was to follow. Whether we consider skill in disputations or in political management, the end of the struggle did not find the Quaker leader at any disadvantage.

The contest began when, in the Tenth month, 1739, Governor Thomas sent a message to the Assembly, suggesting that they make an appropriation to protect the Province against attack, and assist the king. The Assembly took the matter into serious consideration, and explained in a somewhat lengthy preface that they were all loyal subjects, lovers of religion and liberty, and that one of the principal motives which had brought them and their ancestors to the Province was the full enjoyment of liberty of conscience which was granted to them by their great charter, and which the proprietor had pledged himself and his successors "according to the true intent and meaning thereof, should be kept and remain without any alterations inviolably for ever." And then they add, "It is not unknown most of them were of the people called Quakers, and principaled against bearing arms in any case whatsoever." They admit that the circumstances have changed, and that a great

many who have come in since think it to be their duty to fight in defense of their country, families and estates. These also have the same right of liberty of conscience with themselves. They do not condemn the use of arms in others, but they object to any law which would compel a man to bear arms against his conscience; and they add that a law which forces other people to bear arms and relieves the Quakers would be inconsistent and partial. Then they make a suggestion to the Governor, which, if he had been wise, he would have adopted and dropped the matter. They point out that the Charter gave him ample authority to raise a troop himself, and that they did not propose to interfere with his actions in this respect, provided he did not trample upon anyone's conscience. The clause of the Charter granting this authority, which William Penn accepted, it may be interesting to note:

“To the Proprietor aforesaid, his Heirs and Assigns, by themselves or their Captains, or other their Officers, to levy, muster, and train all Sorts of Men of what Condition soever or wheresoever born in the said Province of Pennsylvania for the time being, and to make Warr and to pursue the Enemies & Robbers aforesaid as well by Sea as by Land, even without the Limits of the said Province, and by God's Assistance to Vanquish and take them, and being taken to put

them to Death by the Law of Warr, or to save them at their Pleasure; And to do all, and every other thing which unto the Charge and Office of a Captain General of an Army belongeth, or hath accustomed to belong, as fully and freely as any Captain General of an Army hath ever had the same."

They wound up their address by the pious reflection:

"Not doubting but that Wee shall share in that Protection Our Gracious Sovereign denys not even to the meanest of His Subjects; And having at the same time a due dependence on that Power which not only calms the raging Waves of the Sea, but settts Limits beyond which they cannot pass; And remembering the Words of the sacred Text, That 'Except the Lord keep the City the Watchman waketh but in vain.' "

We find in this paper several interesting indications of the state of feeling among Friends on the subject of war at this date. One was that they were unequivocally opposed to all war under all circumstances; another, that they had no words of condemnation for those who from good motives thought and acted differently, and, thirdly, that their reliance was upon a divine Providence who, they believed, would interfere for their protection.

The Governor was not disposed to recede from the

contest. In an epistle equally lengthy he called their attention to the fact that they were representatives of the whole people; that he had no right to look into their personal religious persuasions, but that it was their duty as representatives to protect a rich Province from invaders. He did not wish to infringe any of their consciences, nor to introduce persecution, for he himself was a great friend of liberty. "But," he said, "as the world is now circumstanced, no purity of heart or set of religious principles will protect us from the enemy." The Assembly had recognized this in the institution of courts and juries. He told them that they would condemn "little rogues" to death for breaking into their houses, and yet they would not use similar means on a larger scale for meeting the more organized attacks upon their property. He had not been unaware of the privileges granted to him by the Charter, and the very fact that William Penn was willing to accept the powers of a Captain-General under this Charter indicated his opinions as to the necessity of bearing arms in defense of his government. Then he puts in a little attack at their trusting in Providence and unwillingness to exert themselves. He says:

"Every Man that acknowledges the Superintendence of one Supreme Being in the Affairs of the World, must be sensible that without His Blessing all

we do will come to nothing; and yet we build, we plant, we sow, and we send Ships to Sea, concluding that these are necessary means for accomplishing the Ends desired. But that we should do all these, and at the same time expect that God shall fight our Battles, without preparing ourselves the necessary means for our Defence, I confess can be no more reconciled to my understanding than that Because the Lord stills the raging Waves of the Sea, the Seamen may therefore leave the Sails of the Ship standing, and go to sleep in a Storm; Or that Watchmen are therefore unnecessary, because Except the Lord keep the City the Watchman waketh but in vain."

The Assembly returned to the attack, and article by article, replied to the Governor's address. They showed that their position inland from the sea, protected by friendly colonies to the north, east and south, made them in no danger of being attacked. Consequently the Governor's argument for the need of defense had no bearing on the case. They will not admit the justice of the comparison between the "little rogue" and the "great invaders." Their argument is this:

"And yet it is Easy to discover the Difference between killing a Soldier, fighting (perhaps) in Obedience to the Commands of his Sovereign, and who may, possibly, think himself in the Discharge of his

Duty, and executing a Burglar who broke into our Houses, plundered us of our Goods, and perhaps would have murdered too, if he could not otherwise have accomplished his Ends, who must know at the Time of the Commission of the Fact, It was a violation of Laws human and divine, and that he thereby justly rendered himself obnoxious to the Punishment which ensued.”

They would evidently have made a stronger case if their attitude towards capital punishment had permitted them to say something more of the sacredness of human life; but, having just enacted laws inflicting the penalty of death for burglary, rape, counterfeiting and other crimes, they could hardly say that they had any objection to the taking of life *per se*. They believe, however, that an Almighty Power does superintend the government of the world, and that he will protect the principles of religion which are agreeable to his will. As to William Penn's being a believer in war, they state, with some sarcasm, that they probably know as much about his opinions as the Governor does. They say, “he not only professed himself a Quaker, and wrote in their favor, but particularly against wars and fighting.” As to the comparison between the preparation for storms at sea and harvests on land, and self-defense in the time of danger, their argument is not as satisfactory as it might be. It is as follows:

“ By a law almost as old as the Creation, Building, Planting, Sowing, and other parts of Agriculture became necessary for the Sustenance of Life; And so to those who would traffick in Parts beyond the Seas, Ships and Seamen were requisite; the Nature of whose undertaking obliged them to Industry in discharge of their Duty as well as for their own Safety, and not attended with any Injury to others; But because we may lawfully build, plant, sow, or send Ships to Sea, or that because it is necessary for Seamen to take care of a Ship in a storm, that therefore it is consistent with Christianity to defend ourselves at the Expense of the Lives of our Fellow-Creatures, tho’ our Enemies, is not equally evident to us; And yet if others think the Arguments forcible, such have their Liberty.”

The Governor, in a couple of days, returned to the attack. He reproved them for their acrimony, which, he says, he little expected from men of their principles, and declares he will not engage in the discussion in that spirit. He thanks them sarcastically for their description of the geography of the Province, which he intimates he is not entirely unacquainted with. And then he again takes up the question of the burglar, where he evidently thinks he has a point:

“ If a Burglar acts contrary to the Laws of Christianity and of the land in breaking open your Houses,

and by those Laws you are justified in putting him to Death; and if a soldier acts contrary to the Laws of Christianity (as he does according to your own principles) and the Laws of Nations, in plundering your Houses and murdering your Families, it will be difficult to shew why you may not as justly put the latter to Death as the former. The Will of the Prince, or the mistake of the Soldier, can have nothing to do in determining the moral Good or Evil of the Action."

He points to their early appropriation of money for the King's use in manifest response to a demand for war funds, and, admitting that he does not know very much about William Penn's writings, he adds:

"As Actions are the best Evidences of a Man's Thoughts, your first Proprietor's acceptance of a Military Charge, his devolving it upon his Lieutenants, and his Commission to a Person to command a Fort at Newcastle, which I have under his own Hand writing, are sufficient Proofs to me of his Opinion; and tho' I have a very high Regard for that Gentleman's Character, render it altogether unnecessary to examine his Writings, if he has wrote on that subject."

And not without force, he replies in conclusion:

"For I believe it will be still thought as little consistent with reason to expect we shall be protected from an enemy without preparing the necessary

Means for Defence, as it would be to expect Grain without Sowing, or Fruit without Planting, and so in other Instances.”

The Assembly contented itself with a general reply to this, stating that they had no delight in controversy; that they did not believe the Province was in danger; that the early appropriations of money for warlike purposes did not prove their utility; that they were steadfastly loyal to King George, and that on the basis of these well-known principles had always enjoyed the protection of the Crown, and that the Province would receive no ill effects from their lack of legislation.

Then the Governor replies in a final argument, and asks the question which has never been answered: “If your principles will not allow you to pass a bill for establishing a militia, if they will not allow you to secure the navigation of a river by building a fort, if they will not allow you to provide armies for the defence of the inhabitants, if they will not allow you to raise men for his Majesty’s service for distressing an insolent enemy, is it calumny to say your principles are inconsistent with the ends of government ?”

There was a veiled irony in many of the Assembly’s replies, which, I suppose, came from the pen of John Kinsey, and which delighted the men who, in the coffee-houses of Philadelphia, followed

the controversy with great interest. As, for instance, when they said that the Province had prospered under the Quaker management before Governor Thomas had anything to do with it, and probably would in the future; "though some Governors have been as uneasy and as willing, and as ready to find fault and suggest dangers as himself." Or again, as the election approached, "If we have committed any mistakes, the time draws near in which our constituents, if they think it necessary, may amend their choice, and the time also draws nigh in which your (counselors' and governor's) mistakes may be amended by a succeeding Governor. Permit us to congratulate our country on both."

During the course of the controversy, parties were gradually forming, and this thrust and counterthrust of arguments were simply appeals to the constituents; for there were no editorial comments in the scanty papers of those days by which public opinion was influenced. The arguments were passed around by word of mouth or by written manuscript, and in many a coffee house or country tavern, and doubtless also on the steps of the meeting houses after the assembly was dismissed, they were repeated and illustrated with ever-increasing emphasis.

Not all Friends took the position that defensive war was inconsistent with Christianity. James

Logan was the leader of a considerable company of young and well-to-do Philadelphians who openly espoused the other side. But at present they were opposed to the Governor's pretensions, and worked with their associates of the yearly meeting.

James Logan in the spring of 1741 contributed to the yearly meeting his advice that all Friends who were conscientious about voting money for warlike purposes should decline their places in the Legislature, a suggestion which the yearly meeting refused even to have read. When one Friend tried to urge Logan's views his neighbor plucked him by the coat-tail and said, "Sit thee down, Robert, thou art single (alone) in this matter."

That the Governor's threat to drive Friends from the Assembly was not purely an empty one, is shown by a letter which he wrote to the English Government, considerably misrepresenting the situation, and recommending that all Quakers be made ineligible to official situations. This was intended to be private, but a friend of the Assembly got possession of it in England, and sent a copy to Philadelphia. Great was the wrath of the men who for half a century had felt themselves responsible for the conduct of affairs, and under whose management had developed the most thriving Province of the new world.

The "Gentlemen's Party," which was the title that the Governor's friends took to themselves, also

girded themselves for the contest, and in the fall election of 1742 there was a great street fight in Philadelphia, the actual participants of which were a number of sailors for the Gentlemen's Party and a bunch of hard-fisted Germans for the Quakers. It is unnecessary to add that the Quakers triumphed both in the street contest and at the polls, and rather increased than diminished their great majority in the Assembly.

They also struck the Governor at another point. He was promised a salary by the Penns, whose agent he was, but this salary had to be voted by the Assembly. During the stringency of the contest the Assembly always forgot to place such an item in their appropriation bills, and for several years he nursed his wrath in poverty. But now being beaten at the polls he began to show signs of yielding. He signed a bill which he had hitherto opposed, and a little salary was granted him. He signed another, and the Assembly began to feel still more generous. Finally he gave way altogether, and all his arrears were paid. He got along very pleasantly with the Assembly during the rest of his official career. He was completely tamed. Fortunately, the Spanish war was short, and the French war which followed was not of such a stringent character as to make the demand for aid from Pennsylvania imperative.

The net results of the contest were a large increase

of liberty for the people of Pennsylvania; the perfect maintenance of their anti-martial principles; the defeat of the Gentlemen's Party at their own political game; the increasing strength among the people of the Quaker leaders in government; the triumph of economy and simplicity in the management of public affairs. John Kinsey's letters, full on the one hand of pious reflections, and on the other, of adroit political argument, had carried the day. The "Country Party," as his friends were generally called, had become supreme. One by one the claims of the proprietors—who were now farming Pennsylvania for what they could get from it, in a very different spirit from that of their high-minded father—were cut down. The possibility of gaining political ends without the sacrifice of principles was beginning to answer the taunt of Governor Thomas that their theories were inconsistent with government. In 1747 Benjamin Franklin writes of the Friends as "that wealthy and powerful body of people who have ever since the war governed our elections and filled almost every seat in the Assembly." Evidently they were good politicians, and the contest with the Governor had resulted in a strengthening of their lines.

John Kinsey died in 1750. He had no successor capable of performing the double duty of leading his yearly meeting as an acknowledged exponent of its

principles, and of showing the way along which his political party could go to victory. Isaac Norris, 2d, who succeeded him as Speaker, and who was a man of the highest integrity and ability, did not have the standing among Friends which his predecessor had, and the leadership of the Country Party went more and more into the hands of Benjamin Franklin, who did not at all sympathize with the ethical principles of Friends, though he was in close accord with their political views.

It has often been asked and never, perhaps, quite satisfactorily answered, how it was that the Quakers with their small numbers managed to maintain the ascendancy in the Legislature which they did through all these discussions. It was owing partly to the fact that the Quaker counties, Chester, Philadelphia and Bucks, had disproportionate numbers of members. That is, the new counties to the west did not receive their full quota of membership as fast as they were settled.

For additional reasons for the Quaker success in politics, we may find some clue in a letter written by Dr. William Smith, afterwards Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, in 1755. He estimates the inhabitants of the Province at 220,000, of whom one-half were Germans, and about 40,000 Quakers. He says that the first generation of Quakers were an honest, sober and thoughtful people, who gave to the

Province an excellent government, and he admits that the great bulk of these out of the Legislature are still conscientious on the subject of war, but that the leaders are working things for their own political advantage, without much regard to principles. They maintain themselves in power by two sets of influences. In the first place, the yearly meeting comes just before the fall elections, and constitutes what we would now call a "Quaker Primary." In the second place, they manipulate the German vote, which readily outweighs all others. They succeed in this from the influence of Christopher Sauer, and his publications in the German language. Sauer is a Mennonite, in sympathy with the Quakers on the subject of war, and of unbounded influence among the Germans. The Germans are deluded with the idea that the Governor's party would establish military conscriptions and heavy taxes, which they had fled from Germany to escape. He also asserts that the establishment of a State militia would be used to reduce Quaker influence among the people, and that this is the real reason that they are afraid of it. And in conclusion he recommends that the Province can only be protected from French invasion by pledging all those who sit in the Assembly to take an oath of allegiance; by taking away the suffrage from all Germans who cannot speak the English language; by sending among them Protestant

ministers and school masters; and by prohibiting the circulation of newspapers, almanacs or other periodicals printed in a foreign language.

These are the statements of a strong political opponent and must be received with considerable allowance. There is, however, a fragment of truth in all of them, and by recourse to them we can probably see how the "Quaker Machine" was maintained.

As to yearly meeting activities, they were exclusively outside the sessions of the meeting. Not one trace of any political movement—unless we may call opposition to slavery and other moral offenses political—ever crept into the sessions of the yearly meeting itself, but political arrangements were probably made among the members as individuals. I do not know any evidence that this was going on, but I do not think it is at all unreasonable to believe that it was. In a body so well disciplined as the Friends in those days were, and so thoroughly committed to government, it can hardly be expected that the views of those who were leaders, alike in church and state, should not be circulated among the membership at these annual gatherings and have much influence.

There is no doubt also that the large German vote went on the same side of the question, and that Christopher Sauer was a warm and efficient ally. We have it on the authority of an Epistle of Explanation written by the quarterly meeting of Philadelphia, in

1755, to the Friends in London, that "our former representatives were, at our last election, chosen throughout the Province by the greatest majority ever known, without accounting the freemen who are foreigners, on whose credulity and ignorance it has been unjustly asserted that we have industriously and artfully imposed. And this was done, not only without the solicitation, but in some instances without the privity or approbation of some that were chosen."

It is perfectly natural, and nothing to the discredit of Friends that the Germans should vote with them. That they carefully nursed this vote, and did not throw away the advantage which they had, may be readily assumed. They were good politicians because they felt their responsibility, and did not mean to part with, as the result of calumny and misrepresentation, the powers which they had assumed at the beginning of the government, and for which they held themselves accountable only to the people.

Dr. Fothergill, who probably voiced the opinion of a good many sober Friends of the day, while fully admitting the righteousness of the cause of John Kinsey and his friends, did not quite like the temper of their epistles. He says, "Your cause is undoubtedly good, but I am afraid you discover a little more warmth than is quite consistent with the moderation we profess. The arguments made use of by the As-

sembly are strong and cogent, but the Governor justly accuses you of too much acrimony."

An interesting little piece of by-play may close this account. Israel Pemberton, Jr., who succeeded John Kinsey as clerk of the yearly meeting, and who was afterwards known as the "King of the Quakers," in the midst of the exciting contest of 1739, criticised the Governor most severely in a company of which Alexander Graydon (he whose memoirs we read with so much interest) was a member. He said that it was the Governor's design to overturn the Constitution, and reduce them to the King's government; that the Governor carried on the debate with the Assembly as if a few friends were chatting it over a table; that he had no doubt that the Governor would use his influence in England to set the Assembly in the wrong, and that he would make an unjust representation of the matter. Graydon narrated this conversation to the Governor, and the next day told Pemberton so, upon which Pemberton said he was glad of it; that he would not make any apology, for it was a good thing that these truths should come to the Governor's knowledge, for his sycophants who lived around him would never tell him, and that he would prove that the Governor said that he would bring matters to extremities. This would not now seem a very serious offence, but the Gov-

ernor was rash and issued a warrant for the arrest of Pemberton. After some discussion in the council as to the legality of this warrant, it was allowed to proceed. The Supreme Court interfered, however, with the serving of the warrant, issued a writ of *habeas corpus*, and ordered that Israel Pemberton, Jr., should not be called before the council, which simply indicates that the court and council were on different sides of the political controversy. The Governor declared this writ illegal, and again ordered the sheriff to serve the warrant, who reported "that Mr. Pemberton read the warrant and called it nonsense; that he, the sheriff, being ordered by the secretary to behave toward Mr. Pemberton with civility, had permitted him to go out of his sight in the house of John Kinsey, Esq., after his word given, that he would not escape, and that he notwithstanding, had escaped." The Governor would not excuse the sheriff, and Pemberton was held in legal confinement, the Governor having come to the conclusion that the writ of the Supreme Court was illegal, under the circumstances. He therefore instructed the sheriff again to find Pemberton, but he had gone to Chester. However, he came back the next day. The sheriff then reports in these words the trouble which Israel gave him in the attempt to serve the warrant:

"That yesterday about twelve of the Clock he

came to Town; his Deputy gave him a Warrant from the Governor to take Mr. Pemberton, Junr.; that he went to Mr. Pemberton's House about one of the clock, and had answer that he was not in town; he went again about three of the Clock, and had answer that he was gone out; he went this morning about three-quarters of an hour after Eight in the morning, and asked his Clerk or Book Keeper if Mr. Pemberton was at home, who said he was, and went to some other Apartment of the House, as he thought, to see for his Master, but returned and said his Master was in bed; Mr. Robinson went to another Door of the House, and asked Mrs. Pemberton if Mr. Pemberton was within, who said he was in Bed; Mr. Robinson asked what time he would be up, and had answer he would in half an hour; he went towards Mr. Pemberton's House about twelve of the Clock, and in his going down Chestnut Street, by John Miller's at the Sign of the City of Dublin, he saw Mr. Pemberton standing on the Platform at his own Door, but when he had got so far as Front street, he saw Mr. Pemberton tack about and go into his House, and since has seen nothing of him."

Evidently the Governor was making himself ridiculous, and the Quaker was getting the better of the manœuvres. An intermediary was found in Andrew Hamilton, the Speaker of the Assembly, who said that Israel Pemberton, Sr., was very uneasy "at

his son's being compelled to keep his house for fear of being taken by the sheriff, to the great prejudice of his business," and the warrant was withdrawn.

It is very easy to sit down with the New Testament and elaborate a convincing argument against war. It is much more difficult when the responsibilities of government are thrown upon you to act consistently with such an argument. The Friends of these times were, it seems to me, rather groping towards a method of putting their principles into practice. They were going over ground which many of us have had to go over again and again in defining the Quaker position. Why are wars wrong? Is it because we are never to resist evil? That is the position of Count Tolstoi, but it never has been ours. Is it wrong because war involves the taking of life? But the Friends of 1740 had given up that contention. Is it wrong, as Jonathan Dymond says, because resistance to evil must never employ criminal methods? If so, can a line be drawn between resisting a burglar who attempts to rob our house, by crippling or imprisoning him, and resistance to an army which in a more organized way would also despoil our goods? What are the limits to force to be used in self-defence? Assuming that killing is always wrong, is taking property belonging to others always wrong? But governments are doing this continually in the way of taxes. Is war wrong simply because it

excites evil passions in the participants? But this may not always be true. Are the immoral methods employed by war made moral by the motives of the participants and the justice of their causes? These questions are worth thinking over, and I for one feel a great deal of sympathy with these Friends of the days from 1740 to 1756, who so skillfully and successfully maintained their side of the controversy, and yet whose actions are somewhat open to criticism from the stern moralist.

THE WELSH SETTLERS OF HAVERFORD.

Under the strict guard of Friends in Philadelphia is an old limp-leather book which contains, in an angular and sometimes almost illegible hand, the business proceedings of the Welsh Friends who established the "Barony" on the banks of the Schuylkill. The records of Haverford Monthly Meeting begin with "the 10th day of the Second month (April), 1684," when, among other interesting events of similar character, "Humphrey Ellis and Gwen Rees haveing declared their Intention of marriage before this meeting, John Bevan and John Humphrey were ordered to Inspect to their Clearness, and to bring an acc't thereof to the next meeting," and again, a month later, "Humphrey Ellis & Gwen Rees haveing laid their Intention of Marriage the Second time before this meeting, and nothing but clearness found on each side, are Left to their freedom to proceed therein."

After the double announcement, Humphrey and Gwen stood up in a public meeting and announced that they took each other in marriage, "promising with divine assistance to be unto her (him) a loving and faithful husband (wife) until death shall separate us." Then the certificate was signed by themselves and by their friends as witnesses, and they

went to their farm in the woods to conquer it for civilization. The previous course of the courtship was hedged about with difficulty. We find the following directions: "That all young men among Friends make known their intention to their parents or guardians before they acquaint the woman's relations, and make it known to the woman's parents or guardians before they speak to them, and if any do otherwise they shall condemn the same."

The Barony is now a rich and popular suburb of Philadelphia. Its ancient woodlands are selling at thousands of dollars an acre, and the descendants of the settlers are among the prominent men of the old town. Their Welsh origin is only betrayed by the proper names, but Jones and Thomas and Roberts, Pugh (ap Hugh) and Price (ap Rees) and Bevan (ap Evan), and the line of stations along the Pennsylvania Railroad—Merion, Narberth, Wynnewood, Haverford, Bryn Mawr, Radnor and St. David's, are their permanent memorials.

They had been land owners in Wales, some "gentlemen" and some "yeomen," and they bought their land of William Penn, 40,000 contiguous acres. They scattered themselves over this great territory, beginning in West Philadelphia and extending northward and westward for twenty miles. Their original idea was to control everything within the limits, to retain their language, customs and nationality, and

to manage their civil affairs, as well as ecclesiastical, through their monthly meeting. So we find, interspersed with religious directions, "It is ordered by the Meeting, & Consent of the Inhabitants of the Township of Haverford & Radnor in pursuance of a Law in that Case made yt ye Inhabitants of ye sd two Townships should pay 1 s. per hundred towards ye takeing of Woolves." It may be inferred that the "hundred" refers to acres owned, and not to wolves destroyed.

In order to retain a means of access to the city they must needs guarantee a sum to the ferryman, so three Friends "are ordered by this meting to collect the mony due to Nathaniel Mull, upon the account of ye ferry, to view their accounts & see what is due him, & to bring an account thereof to the next monthly meeting."

Mull was not the name of the ferryman, but the Cymric penman stumbled at the strange name—*Mul-lineux*—and cut it short.

Another minute requires that the land owners should maintain their line fences.

They were not able to attend to all their secular affairs, however, without the aid of the central government, for in 1685 the Council records "the Complaint of y^e friends of Hertford (Haverford) against the Indians for ye Rapine and Destruction of their

Hoggs." The Council sent for "ye respective Indian Kings with all speed," and the trouble ended.

These Welshmen were many of them owners of considerable property. They brought with them their household furniture—great oak pieces, which have come down to the present day. Their napkins were of the finest linen, and their plate was solid. Copper and pewter ware were abundant, and cash was not lacking.

They almost immediately began speculating in Susquehanna lands, and they had been here but about a dozen years when out of their abundance they were able to contribute to the impoverished New Englanders. "The Friends appointed to collect the subscription of friends towards ye Releif of distressed friends & others in New England bring an acc't yt they collected & paid to the use aforesaid ye sume of 60£, 14s, 11d according to ye appointment of ye meeting."

Their own unfortunate neighbors were also well looked after. "That 15s. be given to help ——— in his present necessity, 5s. out of the Collection of each meeting. ——— are ordered to see the same paid ye said ——— and Likewise to Collect him out of each meeting effects to buy him a Cow and Calfe at Spring, provided he doth repay it if he be able hereafter, It being his proposall to friends when he requested the same."

“It was ordered as followeth That Three pounds of the Collection of Haverford and Meirion is ordered by this meeting to be paid to assist ——— to build him a House, vixt. Thirty shillings of each Township.”

“It is ordered by this Meeting that Cadder Morgan and James Thomas do receive the voluntary gift of Meirion Meeting to assist ——— in his present distress, he haveing sustained loss by fires: and Richard Ornes and Stephen Bevan for Radnor and Maurice Lleullyn and David Humphrey of Haverford to receive the voluntary subscription of each of the said Townships to the said use.”

Nor did they intend that their Barony should be a refuge for defaulters from their old home. “Our friend John Bevan, haveing laid before this Meeting That divers persons came over here, and left debts unpaid, in those parts and places yt they came from, and the Creditors complaining against ye said persons that they did not receive any satisfaction from them for ye said debts, the ffrriends yt are appointed by this meeting to see to such affairs, are desired to deal with them, If there be any such belonging to this meeting.”

Who were these Welsh people, and why did they come to Pennsylvania? As they were fond of stating in their public addresses, they were the descendants of the ancient Britons, a warlike and proud people

who had never been conquered. Their racial devotion was deep-seated, their love of their country and language and customs they supposed to be ineradicable. Yet, when George Fox journeyed thitherward, in 1653, he was received with marked favor. A non-conformist minister of Denbighshire heard of him and sent two members of the congregation "to trie the Quakers." Fox tells us the result: "When these triers came down among us the power of the Lord overcame them, and they were both of them convinced of the truth. So they stayed some time with us and then returned into Wales, where afterwards one of them departed from his convincement, but the other, whose name was John ap John, abode in the truth and received a gift in the ministry to which he continued faithful."

John ap John became the apostle of Quakerism in Wales. He aided in buying the Barony of William Penn, but he never came to America. He died at a great age, venerated as a patriarch of the flock.

Equally influential with him was Richard Davies. He met an itinerant preacher who had some influence with him, but his Quakerism seems to have arisen almost spontaneously. The *thee* and the *thou*, the refusal to doff the hat, to swear, and to make forcible resistance, the confident belief in direct Divine teaching as a practical guide in all matters, the silent worship and the unconquerable sense of duty, sprang

fully developed into being. He went to London to enter into business, but the need of his Welsh neighbors pressed on his heart. He tells the story of his courtship (?) preparatory to his migration: "So the Lord gave me a little time, and He alone provided an help-meet for me; for I prayed unto Him that she might be of His own providing, for it was not yet manifest to me where she was, or who she was. But one time, as I was at Horslydown meeting in South-ark, I heard a woman Friend open her mouth, by way of testimony, against an evil ranting spirit, that did oppose Friends much in those days. It came to me from the Lord, that that woman was to be my wife, and to go with me to the country, and to be an help-meet for me. After meeting I drew somewhat near to her, but spoke nothing, nor took any acquaintance with her, nor did I know when or where I should see her again. I was very willing to let the Lord order it as it seemed best to Himself, and therein I was easy; and in time the Lord brought us acquainted with one another, and she confessed she had some sight of the same thing that I had seen concerning her. So after some time we parted, and I was freely resigned to the will of God; and when we came together again, I told her, if the Lord did order her to be my wife, she must come with me to a strange country, where there were no Friends but what God in time might call and gather to Himself. Upon a

little consideration she said, if the Lord should order it so, she must go with her husband, though it were to the wilderness; and being somewhat sensible of the workings of God upon her spirit in this matter, she was willing to condescend in her mind to what He wrought in her; but by hearkening to one who had not well weighed the matter, she became disobedient to what God had revealed to her, which brought great sorrow and trouble upon her. I went to see her in this poor condition, and I rested satisfied with the will of God in this concern, being freely resigned, if the Lord had wrought the same thing in her, as was in me, to receive her as His gift to me; and after some time, we waiting upon the Lord together, she arose and declared before me, and the other Friend who had begot doubts and reasonings in her mind, that in the name and power of God she consented to be my wife, and to go along with me, whither the Lord should order us; and I said, in the fear of the Lord, I receive thee as the gift of God to me. So I rested satisfied with the will of God, for a farther accomplishment of it."

The young couple went zealously to work. Converts came quickly and in multitudes, and most of them were in jail in a few months. The fighting and unconquered Britons became peace-loving and unresisting Friends. Charles and Thomas Lloyd, of a good old family, and Oxford graduates, neighbors of

Davies, joined them. Thomas became the leader of the Welshmen in Pennsylvania, and, after Penn, the most conspicuous man of the colony, and its Deputy Governor.

Nowhere in Great Britain did persecution rage more fiercely than in North Wales. It was easy to offer the oath of allegiance, and then fines and prisons would logically follow. A priest, with whom Davies had an argument, had the oath tendered to the Quaker leader, and he spent some years in jail as a result. The Lloyds had their full share. Such as were not sent to prison had their property swept away by unreasonable distraints to recover small fines. Their kinsmen, instigated by rage or gain, became their persecutors. There seemed no evidence that this would not go on indefinitely.

Then a haven of hope was opened. William Penn received his grant of Pennsylvania. He wished to call it New Wales, and claimed a Welsh origin for his own name. If his co-religionists could have a real New Wales, free from persecution, where they could educate their children in a pure environment, and retain their ancient customs, modified by their new teachings, they would emigrate bodily.

So a committee of them, including John ap John, Davies, and Charles Lloyd, saw Penn in London. They asked for a Barony, as they afterwards expressed it, "Within which all causes, quarrels,

crimes and disputes might be tried and wholly determined by officers, magistrates and juries of our language." They would have representation in the Provincial Assembly, but all their local officers would be commissioned by themselves alone.

Penn seems to have satisfied them. He had ample powers under the Charter of Charles II., and he gave them promises which, if reduced to writing, appear to have been lost. It was his personal influence that brought them, as Hugh Roberts wrote him ten years later. "I can truly say that many of us had never come here but because of the love and unity and confidence we had in thee."

The stream began to come in 1682, prior to or in company with the proprietor. Dr. Thomas Wynne, the great physician of the colony, was a passenger on "The Welcome." Thomas Lloyd came in on the same ship with Francis Daniel Pastorius, a kindred spirit who was leading his Rhinelanders to Germantown. The largest immigration was in 1684, and in the years immediately succeeding they overflowed the "Welsh Tract" and settled Uwchlan, Charlestown and Nantmeal. Several of their leading men had taken five thousand acres as trustees. These tracts were subdivided to suit the smaller holders, and New Wales became an established fact. They had the usual difficulties of settlers in a woodland, but Philadelphia was near by, game was plentiful, and the In-

dians were friendly. Cabins, soon replaced by more substantial houses of stone, quickly arose. To marry their young people and to provide burial places for their dead were the first communal duties, to be followed in a little time by the building of meeting houses, when the private houses became insufficient. The most ornate Friends' meeting house in Pennsylvania, if old prints are to be relied on, was that at Merion, built in 1695.

There is no doubt that Penn meant to keep his promise of a Barony, though what amount of local government they were to be granted does not appear. He wrote his surveyor, Thomas Holmes, in March, 1684, that settlers in Wales were coming in large numbers, sufficient to occupy 40,000 acres, and "I do charge thee and strictly require thee to lay out said tract."

Nevertheless the immigrants were at first deeply disappointed with the result. They had to give up the idea of their own juries and officials as distinct from those of the province, and in a little time parts of their tract which they had not taken up, began to be surveyed and sold to English settlers. At first their protest was successful and the sales were annulled. This was after Penn had returned to England, and had made Thomas Lloyd his deputy. But Lloyd had no desire for political prominence, and in 1688 Penn sent over John Blackwell, an old Cromwellian sol-

dier, as Governor. He was a well-intentioned but tactless and stubborn man, who set everything awry. The Friends, under Lloyd's lead, protested most vehemently against his movements, and practically tied up the government. The wrangling partly centered about the Welsh tract.

This tract had been entirely in Philadelphia County. A petition came up from the people of Chester County, adjoining, asking that as they were few in number a portion of these Welshmen should be added to them to reduce the individual contributions to the county funds. The petition probably appealed to Blackwell as a wise measure to divide his most persistent opponents and so lessen their political power. They would be in a minority in either county. Several worthy people deposed that they had heard William Penn say that he had intended to run the line through the tract, and a map was found which seemed to support the view. The Welshmen protested vigorously, and asked at least for time to carry the question to England. They appealed to their ancient understanding with the Proprietary, but Blackwell by this time had a sympathetic majority in the Council well in hand, and he forced the division through. Merion Township was placed on one side of the line, and Haverford and Radnor on the other, and there they remain to this day. The Welshmen had refused to have anything to do with government (except to

elect members of the provincial legislature) or to sit on juries or to take part in affairs in either county, but they none the less strenuously opposed this beginning of a separation. The heat engendered by this and other matters made Blackwell's life miserable. Thomas Lloyd was a Quaker minister, and, as Blackwell said, his fellow members had an "inordinate affection" for him. He could unresistingly go to jail in Wales in obedience to an unjust but established government. But in Pennsylvania he felt his responsibilities and knew his rights. Colonel Markham, who sided with the Deputy Governor, thus narrates one of the several scenes of confusion:

"The Govr declared ye Councill to be adjourned till ye next councill day, viz: to ye fifth day of ye same week, at nine of ye Clock, at ye same place; and Rose up out of his place to depart accordingly; upon wch severall of ye members of ye Councill departed. But divers remayned and a great deale of confused noise & clamor was Expressed at & without the doore of ye Govrs roome, where ye Councill had sate, wch occasioned persons (passing by in the streets) to stand still to heare, which ye Govr observing, desired ye sayd Tho Lloyd would forbear such lowd talking, telling him he must not suffer such doings, but would take a Course to Suppresse it, & shutt ye Doore. So he went away, attended with severall of ye members

of ye Councill, others staying behind with ye Governor."

The Welsh refused to abide by the decision of the Council to divide their tract. At the next election of Councillors they all cast their votes for John Eckley, of Philadelphia County, and sent him up to claim membership. Amid much feeling the Governor and his majority ruled him to be ineligible. They also kept out Thomas Lloyd for refusal to comply with their wishes, and Samuel Richardson for an attack on the Governor's authority, notwithstanding his protest, "I will not withdraw. I was not brought hither by thee, and I will not go out by thy order. I was sent by the people, and thou hast no power to put me out." One of the councillors, lamenting the confusion, said, "We have two governors, one inside the council chamber, and one (Thomas Lloyd) outside." As soon as the condition could reach the ears of William Penn, he recalled Blackwell, who, doubtless with sincerity, told the Council, "'Tis a good day. I have given and I do unfeignedly give God thanks for it (which are not vain words), for to say no worse, I was very unequally yoked." Lloyd came in as the head of the government and retained the place till his death.

But the Welsh had not taken up their whole tract, and in 1690 men of other nationalities came in with

claims. The settlers made an eloquent appeal: "We, the Inhabitants of the Welsh Tract in the Province of Pennsylvania in America, being descended of the ancient Britons, who always in the Land of our Nativity, under the crown of England, have enjoyed that Liberty and privilege as to have our bounds and limits by ourselves within which all causes, quarrels, crimes, and titles were tryed, and wholly determined by officers, magistrates, and jurors of our own language, which were our equals; having our faces towards these counties, made motion to our Governor, that we might enjoy the same here,—to the Intent we might live together here, and enjoy our Liberty and Devotion; which thing was soon granted us before we came into these parts."

It was decided that if the Welshmen would pay all quit-rents since 1684 they might preserve their tract intact. They refused the proposition, but expressed a willingness to be responsible for the whole 40,000 acres in the future. This was declined. When it was too late they reconsidered the matter and agreed to accept the conditions. But the commissions to others had already been executed. Their political integrity had been broken, and now their social comradeship was threatened. The Barony was about to pass away, but the "Great Welsh Tract" became a well marked section of the province, leading in enterprise and prosperity, up to the time of the Revolution.

The Friends' meetings were more considerate of Welsh sentiment than the State authorities. The Quarterly Meeting of Chester, in 1700, sent word to the Haverford Friends that as they were in their county they should be joined to their meeting. But Haverford protested, and the Philadelphia meeting strongly supported them: "Whereas Haverford meeting hath belonged to this Quarterly Meeting from the first settlement & for several other reasons this meeting unanimously desire that the Monthly Meeting at Haverford may not be separated from this our Quarterly Meeting"; and so it remains to this day.

The separateness of the Welsh settlers now rapidly departed. Business, marriages, politics drew them into close association with the English, and while their brethren in the old country retained their language, the new country Welshmen, who had so pathetically appealed for national peculiarity, had before the Revolution lost it all.

In this conflict they were in a difficult position. The most of them had retained their Quaker connection. But the old Briton blood moved in their young men, and many of them joined the American army. The rest, whatever their sympathies, adopted, in the contest, a position of passive neutrality for conscience' sake.

In the dark winter of 1777-'8, when the British

army was in Philadelphia, and the starving soldiers of Washington were at Valley Forge and Radnor, the Welsh Tract lay between the two. It was fair game for both. The British foraged without apology. The Americans offered pay, but the Quakers would not take it. Between the two needy armies they lost everything movable. The carefully compiled records of the meeting tell of the number of cattle and horses and hogs, of sheaves of wheat and bushels of potatoes, of blankets and garments, of pots and kettles, with their estimated value, taken from each farmer. Thus we have: "Taken from Isaac Davies of Haverford, by a detachment of the British army commanded by Earl Cornwallis, the 12th of 12th month, 1777, £284 — 10 — 2," the articles being mentioned in great detail; and as if he had not lost sufficiently: "Taken from Isaac Davies by the army under George Washington, commonly called the American Army, £5 — 17." John Roberts lost, at the hands of the American army, live stock, grain, and household matters valued at £500; but there was an especial reason for this, and his future sufferings were more tragical. He was a farmer and miller of Merion. At the time of the Revolution he was in his sixties, the almsgiver and kindly adviser of his neighborhood, of unquestioned integrity and British sympathies. He had just completed a collection for suffering Friends in New England. Some of his friends

in Philadelphia had been exiled to Virginia in a high-handed way by the State government, to prevent their extending aid to the British army then advancing toward the city from the South. He went to Sir William Howe and asked for a company of soldiers to release them—a request which the British commander denied. The meetings and his neighbors disapproved of his action, which became public, and to escape real or fancied danger he took refuge within the British lines, after they had occupied Philadelphia. When Cornwallis, in December, 1777, organized the foraging party to Merion and Haverford, just noted, he took Roberts along as an unwilling guide.

The next spring the British evacuated Philadelphia, and all the open Tories went with them to New York, knowing the fate that awaited them if captured by the irate mob, which, for a little time, ruled the city. Roberts quietly remained. He was tried before Justice McKean and convicted of high treason. A thousand men of high standing, including his jurors and generals in the American army, attested to his character, and petitioned for his pardon without avail. His meeting refused to interfere, because it could not sanction the actions for which he had been tried, but its members joined heartily in the efforts to save him from the gallows. He expressed his penitence and quietly met his fate.

Such is the story, as the records of the Quaker

meetings show it. The court records were lost, and in order to account for the treason various reports have been circulated—that he mixed glass with the flour which he furnished to the American army, that he poisoned their springs, and so on. On the face of them these are false, but recently the manuscript notes of Judge McKean, embracing the case, have been recovered from a Philadelphia junk-shop, and the veracity of the ecclesiastical records has been established.

HOW THE FRIENDS FREED THEIR SLAVES.

The last slaves held by Pennsylvania Quakers were manumitted, wherever legally possible, about the time of the battle of Yorktown.

It had taken nearly one hundred years of agitation to bring about this result. The German Quakers, of Germantown, had protested in 1688: "There is a liberty of conscience here which is right and reasonable, and there ought to be likewise liberty of the body, except for evil-doers, which is another case. But to bring men hither, or to rob and sell them against their will, we stand against." From that time on the movement for abolition had advanced. In 1696 the Yearly Meeting advised not "to encourage the bringing in of any more negroes, and that such as have negroes be careful of them."

The Friends of Chester County were particularly urgent, and ceased not to press the matter on the attention of the Yearly Meeting. In 1711 they reported that "their meeting was dissatisfied with Friends buying and encouraging the bringing of negroes." The next year they asked that London Yearly Meeting, as the central body, do something to bring about some concerted action of all Friends the world over. But London was not ready, and in 1714 Philadelphia returns to the matter:

"We also received your advice about negro slaves,

and we are one with you that the multiplying of them may be of a dangerous consequence, and therefore a law was made in Pennsylvania, laying twenty pounds' duty upon every one imported there, which law the Queen was pleased to disannul. We could heartily wish that a way might be found to stop the bringing in more here; or, at least, that Friends may be less concerned in buying or selling of any that may be brought in; and hope for your assistance with the government if any farther law should be made discouraging the importation. We know not of any Friend amongst us that has any hand or concern in bringing any out of their own country; and we are of the same mind with you, that the practice is not commendable nor allowable amongst Friends; and we take the freedom to acquaint you, that our request unto you was, that you would be pleased to consult or advise with Friends in other plantations, where they are more numerous than with us; because they hold a correspondence with you, but not with us, and your meeting may better prevail with them, and your advice prove more effectual."

In 1715, and again in 1716, the Chester Friends return to the charge: "The buying and selling of negroes gives great encouragement for bringing them in." To this the Yearly Meeting would only reply advising its members to avoid such purchases, and added: "This is only caution, not censure."

Matters stood until 1729, when again, in response to another request from Chester, the meeting minuted "that Friends ought to be very cautious of making any such purchase for the future, it being disagreeable to the sense of this meeting." Advices to this effect were now given almost yearly, and in 1743 the following was added to the Queries: "Do Friends observe the former advice of our Yearly Meeting not to encourage the importation of negroes or to buy them after imported?" which, a few years later, was strengthened into: "Are Friends clear of importing or buying negroes, and do they use those well which they are possessed of by inheritance or otherwise, endeavoring to train them up in the principles of the Christian religion?"

Thus the sentiment against slavery was fostered, and in 1758 the Yearly Meeting was brought to decisive action. After rejecting several compromises, tending to limit the advice as heretofore to the slave trade, the adopted minute stood: "This meeting fervently desires . . . that we would steadily observe the injunction of our Lord and Master to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, which it now appears unto this meeting would induce such Friends who have slaves to set them at liberty, making a Christian provision for them according to their ages." A committee was appointed, with John Woolman its most active worker, to extend Christian

advice to slaveholders and persuade them to release their slaves.

For twenty years after this date there are many records on the minutes of monthly meetings of voluntary or persuaded manumissions. They were made individually matters of record, to prevent the same negro ever again being seized.

Some, however, held out, and in 1775, in the midst of the throes of the outbreaking war, the meeting decided it had waited long enough: "Such members as continued to hold slaves are to be testified against as other transgressors are by the rules of our Discipline for other immoral, unjust and reproachful conduct." This was an instruction to the monthly meetings to take up each case individually, and, after careful labor and much persuasion, if he still remained recalcitrant, to disown him by the Society. This was done in some refractory cases. Others were complicated. Slaves were owned by minors; or husband and wife were not both members, and legal manumission could not be obtained, or other perplexing questions had to be settled:

"Most of the Friends appointed to inquire into the circumstances of several negro slaves on whom it is thought J—— M—— had a claim, report they have done accordingly, and are informed that his brother, S—— M——, deceased, by his last will

gave the remainder of his estate to him after the bills and legacies were paid, and appointed him executor of his will, and that his said brother had two negro men and one negro boy slaves, but that he had not taken upon him the administration of the estate, and did not intend to do it on account of the negroes. They advised him that in case administration should be granted to another person, and there should be other estate enough to pay the debts and legacies (which he seemed not to doubt of) that he should discharge the administrator from the negroes and set them free, otherwise if they should be sold to pay debts and legacies, and he receive the remainder of the estate, he would be the cause of their continuation in bondage, which advice being considered is approved of."

Faithfully and patiently the work was performed, and the end of the war saw the end of slavery in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, and the voluntary compensation of many slaves for their labor while in bondage. This was advised in 1779: "The state of the oppressed people who have been held by any of us in captivity and slavery, calls for a deep inquiry and close examination how far we are clear of withholding from them what, under such an exercise, may open to view as their just right." Arbitrators decided the amount, and the former slaveholders liquidated an undemanded debt.

The years prior to the war had seen the freedom of all slaves held by faithful Quaker masters. Those who in 1775 were brought to face the alternative of manumission or ejection were such as had resisted all previous appeals to their sense of right or justice. They were either unconvinced of wrongdoing, or were unwilling to make the pecuniary sacrifice. Whether morally or financially recalcitrant, the matter must now be pressed home to them, and the Quarterly Meetings took up their cases individually in serious earnest. There was to be no haste and no scolding, only kindly personal exhortation, continued time and again, till the papers were signed or the stiff-necked slaveholder pronounced incorrigible. In Bucks Quarterly Meeting James Moon was on the Committee, and in a manuscript journal, from which I shall freely quote, he gives in detail the visits paid and the negroes freed. We can wish that he had gone further and told the arguments on both sides, for many an interesting conference must have preceded the decision in the old Quaker homesteads of Bucks County. From other sources we may gather that the recusant would plead the good treatment accorded to the negroes, his constant care to feed, clothe and educate them, and the fact that they could not be better off in freedom, for slavery was never a harsh institution among the Pennsylvania Friends. He would relate the possible ruin of himself and family

by the loss, and ask for time to make the adjustment. He would agree to free them by will, or after a term of years. To all of this they would considerably listen and gently reply, removing difficulties, suggesting remedies, calling attention to the already accrued debt for past unpaid services, but above all appealing to the eternal principle that one man had no *right* to hold another in bondage; that the slave had a just claim to the liberty of making his own bargains and moving about at his will; that slavery was an iniquitous institution, and that no spiritual blessings could attend that man who in any degree countenanced it; that the peace of mind to be gained by self-sacrifice was worth more than all the possible rewards of wickedness; that no considerations of expediency should weigh aught against pure goodness and Christian rectitude. As we may read in this journal, these arguments in the great majority of cases produced the results, and the slaveholder consented. Immediately a form of manumission prepared to meet the case was at hand, and the negroes were legally and finally freed.

The opening of the journal tells their proposed method of procedure:

“DIVERS of the Committee appointed by the Quarterly Meeting of Bucks with Several Friends appointed by the respective Monthly Meetings to Visit those of our Members who hold their fellow Men in

bondage & Captivity Met together at Middletown Meeting House the 7th of the 3 Month 1776 And after a Conference on this Weighty Subject it was Concluded to give a more Close and Solid Attention thereto in Order that this good Work may be forwarded & Friends more & more dipt into a proper & Lively Exercise for the Advancement of this part of our Testimony. It was also proposed & agreed that Friends should procure a particular & Distinct Account of the names of the Masters & of their Disposition in this respect The Negroes Names and their Ages, & Whether they Can Read or Write, what they are Capable of & what their Masters are Willing to do.

“The Committee then Agreed to Meet at the House of Joshua Richardson at 8 OClock the next Morning.”

The first day's work included four visits, and the net result was four freed men from two masters. The other two were left for further care:

“Agreeable to Appointment the following Friends Met at the Said Joshua Richardson's, Viz: Samuel Eastburn, Nicholas Waln, James Moon, Thomas Stapler, Jonathan Kirkbride, William Richardson & William Blakey. And Joshua Richardson was possessed of a Negroe Man named Joseph Primis, Aged 66 Years & a Mullatto Man named Joseph, Aged about 22 Years, both of whom he has set free by In-

struments of Writing Dated the 8th of the 3d Month, 1776.

“ The same friends then went to Jonathan Willet’s who hath 7 slaves, Viz: A Negroe Man Named Prince, about 30 Years of Age, an Orderly Man; A Negroe Woman named Dinah, Aged about 26 Years; & five Children, Viz, 4 girls, One Aged about 10 years, Named Lydia; another about 7 years of Age Named Margaret; another about 5, named Isabel; another about 3, Named Jude, & a Boy about 3 or 4 Months Old Named Stacy. Jonathan seemed pretty well Disposed & has friends Advice under Consideration.

“ From thence they proceeded to Joseph Thornton’s, who has 5 Slaves, Viz, A Negro Man about 31 Years of Age, Named Cuff; A Negro Woman about 24 Years Old, Named Silvia, & 3 Children, Viz: One Boy about 6 years old, Named Pompey, & 2 Girls, One about 4 Years Old Named Rose, the other about 2 Years Old, named Violet. Joseph & his Wife neither of them appearing Willing to Set them at Liberty, it is thought Necessary friends Care be Continued towards them.

“ Then went forward to John Plumley’s, who had 2 Negroe Men, one Aged about 100 Years Named Cudgjo, the other about 52 Years, Named Ishmael, both of whom he has Set at Liberty by Instruments of Writing Dated the 8th of the 3d Month, 1776.

“Then agreed to Meet at John Jenk’s the next morning.”

Two discouraging visits began the next day’s work, but two days spent with the third offender, days we may well imagine full of earnest entreaty, and during which the freedom of the time permitted them to remain as guests, brought their reward in five more free men:

“According to Appointment the same friends Met at the Said John Jenk’s, who has One Negroe Named James, Aged about 52 Years, but doth not appear disposed to Set him at Liberty, therefore further Labour is thought necessary.

“Then proceeded to Isaac Stackhouse’s, who hath One Negroe Man, named Ishmaiel, about 56 Years of Age, and Isaac not appearing at present in a Disposition to Set him at Liberty, it is thought necessary friends Care be continued to him.

“Then Samuel Eastburn, Nicholas Waln, James Moon & William Blakey went to Bristol to Ennion William’s, and spent that Evening with him & his Wife on the Same Occasion, & staid till 2d. Day Morning, being the 11th of the Mo. and then Ennion was prevailed with to Set his five Negroes at Liberty by Executing for each of them severally an Instrument of Writing Declaring their Freedom: Their names and ages are as follows, viz:

A Negroe Man Named John, about Years of Age,
Another Named Levi, about Years of Age,
Another Named Sampson, Aged about Years,
Another Named Samuel, Aged about Years,
Another Named Nathaniel, Aged about Years.”

After two months the work continued:

“The 2d Day of the 5th Month 1776 several Friends met at Middletown Monthly Meeting and Concluded to meet next Day about 8 OClock at William Bidgood’s in order to Visit Such Members of the Falls Meeting as hold Slaves in Bondage. Where according to appointment the following friends Met, Viz: Thos. Stapler, William Blakey, John Nutt, Thomas Wilson, William Richardson, John Merrick, & James Moon; and mentioning the Cause of their Visit to William & his Wife, who had one Negroe Woman Nained Jane Aged about 60 Years, William appeared quite willing to Set her at Liberty and accordingly Executed an Instrument in Writing under his hand & Seal, Declaring her to be a free Woman.

“Then the same Friends went to John Brown’s, who has 4 Negroes, Viz: A Negroe Man named Peter, Aged about 48 Years; A Mulatta Woman Named Savina, Aged about 33 Years; a Girl named Hannah, about 12 Years Old, and a Boy Named James, about 6 Years Old; But altho’ John appeared in a free open Disposition, Yet did not discover any

inclination to Set his Negroes at Liberty, therefore a further Labour is thought Necessary.

“ Then the same Friends went to Joseph Lovett’s, who appeared free and open with Friends, but did not appear willing to Set or Declare his Negroes free. Therefore further care to be extended; he has 3, Viz: A Negroe Woman Named Barbary, Aged about 22 Years & two Children, the one a Girl about 3 Years Old Named Silvia & the other a Mulatta Named Dinah aged about 6 Months.

“ Then William Blakey, Thomas Wilson, John Merrick & James Moon went to George Brown’s, who has 2 Negroes, One Named William, Aged about 66 Years, on whose account George Executed a Writing under his Hand, Declaring him a free Man; the other a youth about 20 or near 21 Years of Age, Named Tattlum, but George was not willing to declare him free as yet, but gave friends to Expect he would Do it some future time: Friends staid there all Night.

“ The next Morning (being the 4th of the Month) James Moon, John Nutt, Thomas Wilson & William Blakey Visited Sarah Growden, who has 3 Negroes, Viz: An Antient Woman, Aged 60 Years or Upwards, Named Rose; a Negroe Woman, Named Flora, Aged about 28 Years, & a Lad about 11 or 12 Years of Age, Named Mark, he being at school at the same time). Sarah received the Visit kindly and

informed them that Altho' She was not Disposed to set her Negroes at Liberty While She Lived, Yet she had taken Care to Make Such provision for them as that they Should not be kept in Bondage or Slavery after her Death.

“ Then went to Joseph Milner's, who has a Negroe man named Peter —— Aged about 49 Years, but Joseph appeared to Stick in the Mire and it seems as if it would be hard to pull him out, therefore further Labour Necessary.

“ Then Friends went to Robert Lucas's who has a Girl about 22 Years of Age, Named Zilpah (then at school.) Robert received Friends in a free open manner & acknowledged the practice of making Slaves of our fellow Men to be wrong and Proposed to take the Matter of freeing his Negroe into more close Consideration.

“ Then friends went to Elizabeth Warder's, who had 12 Negroes, Viz: A Negroe Woman named Hager Aged near 69 Years; Another named Dinah, Aged near 41 Years; a Negroe Man named Virgil, near 36 years of Age; a Negroe Woman Named Hannah, near 20 Years of Age; Two Negroe Women, Viz: Fanny & Ruth, Near 16 Years of Age; a Negroe Girl named Hager, Aged about 13 Years; Another Girl Named Amy, about 10 Years of Age; A Negroe Lad named Aaron, between 9 and 10 Years of Age; A Negroe Girl Named Mary about 3 Years

Old; Another Named Sarah near a Year Old; Another Named Nancy near a year old. Elizabeth appeared to take the Visit kindly & seemed very desirous of Friends' Advice respecting her Negroes; As her case and the Circumstances attending it appeared somewhat Difficult, Friends gave her some Advice and left the matter to her further Consideration."

The case of Elizabeth Warder will show how persistently the Friends kept at the task. We will follow it through to its conclusion. What were the exact nature of the difficulties we cannot tell, but on the 20th of Eighth month, 1776, the Committee again saw her. "She confessed a considerable uneasiness and difficulty in respect to her negroes, and seemed to be desirous of Friends' advice therein." They urged her at least to give the children an education. "She appeared to take Friends' visit kindly."

Again on the 28th of First month, 1777, "Elizabeth expressed a considerable difficulty and uneasiness in regard to the circumstances and conduct of her negroes, and was prevailed with to set one of them (an antient woman) at liberty, but could not be prevailed upon to do anything further with regard to the rest."

On the eighth day of the Eleventh month, 1777, the Committee gave Elizabeth further advice, when she set free two women, and two or three of their

children. On the eighth day of the Eighth month, 1778, there was another "full opportunity." "But Elizabeth appeared altogether to decline giving any more of her negroes their freedom and liberty; alleging that those two young women she had freed and set at liberty did not conduct well as they ought to do." Two months later "it seemed difficult for her to proceed any further at present in setting her negroes at liberty from bondage," and the matter drifted along till 1780, when another unsuccessful effort was made to induce her to free her remaining six slaves. Finally, on the 15th day of First month, 1781, she freed five of them, and agreed to give the sixth, an old slave woman, "a piece of good silk to make a bonnet which we judged was more than sufficient wages for that time." A few months later she freed the woman.

This case is a sample of the continuous labor expended, which nearly always proved successful. A very few, perhaps not more than three or four in the whole Quarterly Meeting, held out and were disowned. One who had refused to accept the perennial advice is left in this way: "All that could be said could not prevail upon her to manumit. She appeared determined to keep them under her command while she lived, but signified she should leave them to have their liberty after her decease, intimating that she should leave Friends at liberty to proceed

as they thought best." This liberty they proceeded to take. "Her case is under the care of Falls Monthly Meeting, and a testimony is likely to go against her, which (written later) was afterwards issued by said Monthly Meeting, and she thereby dis-united in religious fellowship in society with Friends, as her persisting in and endeavoring to justify her conduct justly deserved."

These are only a few of the many cases which James Moon tells about, and he adds, in summing up this part of the labor, "Thus far I have pursued this subject until I don't know of any Negro being kept in a state of bondage or slavery for term of life by any member of the Falls Monthly Meeting, except a very few instances where the mistresses are in membership and the masters not."

But the work of the committee was not done when the blacks were freed. Their welfare was to be inquired into, so a series of visits to their houses followed. One record may suffice as a sample of many: "Went to Cuffy Kelsey and visited him and his family, himself being about 50 years of age; his wife Margaret, almost 42 years of age; a daughter between 8 and 9 years old, and a sucking child; they appear to have things pretty well about them and that they may do pretty well with care and industry." Religious services in the homes accompanied these inquiries into physical conditions.

One other service yet remained,—to see that these men and women, who had been working for their masters all their lives, or who had been sold and the price retained, should have at least partial compensation for past services. They were not to be thrust into freedom without old debts being liquidated. The willingness of these persistent slaveholders to comply is the best proof of the effectiveness and purity of motive of the labors of the committee. Here is one of several successful efforts:

“The 10th of the 12th Month, 1781; After Conclusion of the Meeting for Negroes, Thomas Watson, James Moon, & Samuel Smith went to Bristol, and had a Seasonable opportunity that Evening with Phineas Buckley & his wife Mary, Respecting the Case of Cuff Douglas, a Negroe Man, who Divers years back purchased his wife Dido of Ennion Williams paying said Williams a Considerable Sum of Mony for his wife & their three Children’s freedom; And since the Decease of Said Ennion Williams, the Said Phineas Buckley inherits the sd. Ennion’s Estate; this matter was therefore recommended to the Solid & Disinterested Consideration of Said Phineas Buckley & his wife, Whether in Equity and Justice there was not Something Justly Due to the Said Negroe Man from the Estate of the Said Ennion Williams; And, as he the Said Buckley Inherits the Said Estate, Whether upon a Due and Serious Considera-

tion of the Circumstances of the Case, there was not in Justice Something Due from him to the said Cuff Douglas. Which, after being closely recommended to their Consideration that Evening, and mentioned again to them next Morning, when Thomas Stapler was also present, they appeared to take friends' Visit in a friendly manner, And to have the matter with some weight on their minds, and Phineas Signified that he had for Some time had thoughts of doing Some thing for Said Cuff, if the circumstances of his Affairs was Such, and a way opened for him So to Do; And he expressed to friends, that he Still Continued in the Same mind; upon which friends left the matter to his further Solid Consideration.

“ On the 6th of the 12th Month, 1783, James Moon, John Simpson, William Blakey & Samuel Smith went to Bristol, And took another opportunity with Phineas Buckley & Mary his wife, in Respect of their making Some Restitution to the aforesaid Cuff Douglas, an Aged Negroe Man; who upon their being treated with on this matter, Appeared to take friends' advice in a good Disposition, and Signified that they had had that matter under their consideration, and proposed to give or pay him Something in order to enable him to get some Necessarys against the Approaching Winter.

“ The 21st of the 2nd Month, 1784, Report was made by the Select Committee appointed to have the

Care of Such Cases as relates to making restitution among our own Number, that they had Visited a friend, (Phineas Buckley) and found him in a good disposition; and he being present Signified that he had done Something this Winter towards the Relief of a Certain aged Negroe Man (the aforesaid Cuff Douglas) by way of Restitution.

“The 19th of the 2d Month, 1785. Report was made by one of the aforesaid committee that the Case in Bristol (to wit, the Case of Phineas Buckley) was Settled to a good Degree of Satisfaction, he having given his obligation to pay a Considerable Sum of money to a friend in trust, and for the use and Benefit of the Said Negroe Man, namely Cuff Douglas, and the Support of his family.”

In all, some seventy negroes were freed in this Quarterly Meeting and well started in life. If the same proportion existed elsewhere, possibly some 700 to 1,000 slaves were liberated in this final clearing up process in the Yearly Meeting. That much work of the same kind had been previously done is shown by the diary of Isaac Jackson, who in 1759 was on a similar committee in another Quarterly Meeting, where he estimated that 1,100 slaves were held by members of the Society of Friends.

This process, with its ramifications extending into the community, was creating a wholesome sentiment against the system. It is not, therefore, a matter of

surprise that Pennsylvania led in the passage of abolition laws. In 1780 a bill passed the legislature, making all slaves born after that date free at twenty-one. The author was George Bryan, an active member of the regime which came into power by the extinction of Quaker political influence at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. "Our bill," he writes Samuel Adams, "astonishes and pleases the Quakers. They looked for no such benevolent issue of our new government exercised by Presbyterians." Thus it happened that the long contest waged for almost one hundred years from the time that Pastorius and his friends petitioned the Yearly Meeting in 1688, wrought out its beneficent results under a political party to which the Friends were utterly opposed. The sentiment had been created in the commonwealth and could not be resisted. It would have seemed historic justice if the lifelong advocates of the righteous reform could have presided at its triumph. But the fact that it did triumph was enough satisfaction for them. The self-effacement always in evidence in their political connections enabled them to rejoice most heartily with the freed black men, even though the last act of the drama was decreed by their theological and political antipodes, the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of Western Pennsylvania.

THE FRIENDS' MEETING.*

If any excuse is needed for addressing such an audience as this on a subject so familiar as the one on which I am to speak, it may be found partly in the fact that new generations are constantly arriving at years of intellectual maturity, and hence the presentation must be continually renewed; and partly in the fact that this revolutionary age has a tendency to cause us to prove all things over and over. Many of our dearest and most tenaciously-held beliefs have been questioned by the remorseless progress of modern thought, and every one with any openness of mind has found it necessary to examine and often to recast his whole scheme of ethics and theology.

I do not hold that the beliefs of the early Friends should be held too sacred to be submitted to the same searching test. They were men who themselves came boldly out from the cherished beliefs of their age, and with marked originality laid down a program for themselves which was in itself revolutionary. I apprehend they would have been the last to fetter thought and freedom, still less to stifle that fountain of truth from which they drew, which, according to

* This and the following paper were given to various audiences in and around Philadelphia in 1904 and 1905.

their most cherished doctrine, is new to every age and every person.

“Worshippers of light ancestral
Make our present light a crime,”

and the liberty they themselves cherished they intended to pass on undimmed, even by adherence to their own prepossessions, to us their children. In this age of querying and analysis we may, therefore, very properly submit to our laboratory methods the positions of Fox and Barclay. It will be found that they looked at things in many respects differently from ourselves, and that we have practically cast aside, or modified, certain positions, in the fuller light of the two and a half centuries following.

Is this the case all around? Must we discard George Fox Quakerism *in toto*, or in fundamental principles, for a newer and a better philosophy of religion, to adapt it to expanding thought and new science, to the developments of biology and psychology and criticism of the twentieth century?

In reply to this I will quote from Professor James, of Harvard, a modern of the moderns, utterly unprejudiced in favor of our Society, but fearless in matters of investigation. In his “Varieties of Religious Experience,” published within a year (the substance of the Gifford lectures given at Edinburgh the previous winter), he says: “The Quaker religion which

he (George Fox) founded is something which it is impossible to overpraise. In a day of shams, it was a religion of veracity, rooted in spiritual inwardness, and a return to something more like the original gospel truth than men had ever known in England. So far as our Christian sects to-day are evolving into liberality, they are simply reverting in essence to the position which Fox and the early Quakers so long ago assumed. No one can pretend for a moment that, in point of spiritual sagacity and capacity, Fox's mind was unsound. Every one who confronted him personally, from Oliver Cromwell down to county magistrates and jailers, seems to have acknowledged his superior power."

What would be your answer if you were asked about the particular phase of Quaker doctrine to which he refers when he says that as the Christian sects have developed in liberality they have approached the positions held by George Fox? Does he refer to moral views or theological, and if so which ones? or to the peculiarities of dress and language, or to their attitude towards government, or to the type of Christian character developed?

I want briefly to make an attempt to answer this question to-night, to convince us that there are certain strongholds of Quakerism, to use Caroline Stephen's expression, to which we may trust even in this overturning age to justify the strong words of

Professor James. The most characteristic thing about us is the Friends' Meeting. He who approves of this, whatever other views he may have, is very largely a Friend. It has always been so. Masson, the author of the "Life and Times of John Milton," which, as you know, were also the times of George Fox and his friends, gives an interesting description of the conduct of Friends during the persecutions that arose about the Conventicle Act. This act prohibited more than five people to meet together for worship, except according to the forms of the established church. He says that the other Nonconformist sects evaded it by professing to be meeting for social purposes, and had jugs of beer on the tables, or went off into some secret place. But the Friends kept on with their meetings openly. When their houses were torn down, they met in the rubbish. Any other meeting could be broken up by abstracting some of the machinery—the altar, or the surplice, or the candles, or, at the most, the minister; but a Friends' meeting could be stopped only by imprisoning every individual member. They needed no machinery. They went on without the minister. If some were taken away, the balance held the meeting; and though being covered with sand and reviled with epithets must have been rather distracting, they mused on immovably in spite of them.

This, I think, indicates the theory of the Friends'

meeting. It may be held anywhere or at any time. No one person is necessary. Any number of people, of any grade of life, if in the right spirit, may hold it. Its primary object is not to receive instruction by sermon or song or prayer. Each member must be a living, active member, and not passively a recipient of valuable truths from some other member or minister.

Every writer of consequence places the doctrine of direct divine communion as the basis of Quaker theology,—“the root,” as William Penn expressed it, “of the goodly tree of doctrine that springs from it.” It is very satisfactory as a philosophical basis of doctrine, for it allows the accretions of modern thought a convenient and satisfactory place in a reasonable scheme of faith and conduct. One can in some way connect logically every important belief or rule of conduct with it. Every soul is capable of direct contact with God, and may be taught of Him. Hence this is more than a satisfactory basis of a philosophy of religion. It is a practical guide to life. Just where its province is often difficult to determine. Hence there arise two dangers, one in either extreme. One places the emphasis on the human reason and judgment, and ignores Divine guidance except as an unconscious factor. The other consigns human wisdom to oblivion, and places all dependence in all matters on supernatural guidance. The one is the error of the non-Friend, the other of the Friend.

The one omits the most potent factor in the development of the world, the other neglects the God-given powers of the human intellect, and shirks problems quite within his own ability to work out.

In the Gospels you find very little in the way of constructive theology, and very little in the way of direct attack upon existing evil and immorality. Yet this was the most corrupt age of Roman dominion. Immoral practices pervaded society, the State, and religion; slavery, cruelty, debauchery were never more prevalent. Does it not seem strange that Jesus Christ does not specifically condemn them? or, for instance, that Paul, in sending the runaway slave Onesimus back to his owner, does not attack the institution of slavery? Not if we understand it aright. Christ might have entered upon a crusade against existing ills, but His mission extended into the future. At the crucifixion the tangible effect of His life was only a very few disciples. He apparently made very little impression on the world. Josephus, who within fifty years afterward wrote a history of the Jews of his time, leaves Him out, or makes only a doubtful reference to Him, though he mentions John the Baptist. But these few disciples possessed a new Spirit, and that new Spirit began to revolutionize the world. It extended its influence from man to man. Gross evils began to fall, not so much because they were attacked, as

because the people were lifted to a plane above them and they disappeared. Gladiatorial shows in time passed away; the worst evils of slavery were mitigated, and provisions for the sick and aged began to arise,—institutions before unknown. The Spirit gradually conquered the worst vices of the Roman world, and when the barbarian came down, it began over again with him. It is unnecessary to follow its triumphant career. The world has been growing better continually, and all because the Spirit of Christianity has been doing its work through faithful men and women.

Now this Spirit of history is none other than the Holy Spirit of God, to which George Fox gave its rightful place as the most important agent in the world. He called it the Seed, Christ within, the Inward Light, and so on. But it was none other than the influence by which the world had been moved God-ward ever since the day of Pentecost. Friends have not been alone in recognizing the existence of the Holy Spirit in the world. The Biblical references to it are too numerous and too plain, and its work in many cases too evident, for Christians to doubt its existence.

What, then, is our position? It seems to me something like this: Other denominations have gone on with their Christian work as best they could, trusting that this work would be blessed by the Spirit.

Friends have sought to understand the manner of its working, and have refused to enter upon many forms of serious spiritual endeavor without its conscious and manifest guidance. The others have done the best they could with their human powers, and have trusted in many cases most justifiably, that God would sanction their good intentions and honest effort by His blessing. Friends have said, or should have said, if logical, "In certain ways the intellectual and moral powers of the man should be used to their full. But in the direct religious functions of worship and ministry, which involve contact with the Divine Soul Himself, we will await the influence of that soul, lay ourselves open to its subtle suggestions and magnetisms, and what it commands, that will we do, and that only. It shall be our pillar of cloud and fire, and where it stops there will we pitch our tents; when it moves, then will we follow."

I have no criticism to make of other forms of Christian service. I have no testimony against them. They, because of the number and zeal of their followers, are doing more to move on the world than ourselves. But I cannot but think that our effort to take the Holy Spirit into account, and to make practical adaptation to the laws of its working, to make our arrangements *as if* it were really an acting factor in advance of action, is the truest, the highest, and the best basis of religious work, to which we must be faithful, by standing by it fully and logically against

the temptations of expediency. We believe it does move and guide those who are in a condition to be moved and guided, and that this condition is quietness before its operations, a waiting and teachable and willing spirit.

But is this conscious teaching a reality? Is not the other form of religious service really the true Christian method?

I have said that the moral development of the world since the Christian era is based on the spread of the Christ Spirit in human hearts, and then the outworking of this Spirit in effort. The Spirit has worked through all obedient Christians. In the case of Friends I think we may claim it has worked more effectively and more early in the history of many moral reforms. The slavery question is often cited. Here Friends were decades ahead of other denominations. I believe the same is true of war. It is equally true of a number of other forms which I shall not now mention.*

How do you explain this? Not on the basis of greater intelligence and ability to form a better ethical philosophy; not as a logical outcome of any other doctrine held by them, so far as I know; not because they were more earnest in Christian work than many others who held different views; but because, as it seems to me, when Friends got together in their religious meetings in silence and attentiveness, the

* See the first chapter in this book.

Holy Spirit revealed to them the truth of the matter; because they did not argue the rightness of a thing from its immediate results; because, as Whittier says,

“They felt that wrong with wrong partakes,
That nothing stands alone
That whoso gives the motive makes
His brother’s sin his own.
And pausing not for doubtful choice
Of evils great and small,
They listened to the Inward Voice
That turned away from all.”

This verse is an epitome of the Friend’s moral philosophy. All wrong is one. Do any wrong thing, and it strengthens evil all around. Do a right thing, and it cuts off the allies and resources of evil. Moreover, every time you do anything of neutral quality, knowing its probable evil influence, you are accountable. You make your brother’s sin your own. It is not a question of choosing the less of two evils. If you base right and wrong on results only, adopting utilitarian ideas, you are hopelessly muddled. Wrong ceases to be anything definite. If a man says, “I think this will do good,” he becomes his own standard, and in his short-sighted wisdom he grievously, if innocently, errs. Yet this is the prevailing philosophy of the day. “There are worse things than war,” say its advocates, and so the wickedness of war is sanctioned. While not denying the statement, the Quaker cannot admit

that it is a justification. "If I do not kill this worthless man, he will destroy my valuable life," says the man attacked by a highwayman; "I choose the lesser evil,"—and so he has murder to answer for. As a matter of fact, you do not *have* to commit evil; you can suffer, you can die, but you never *have* to load your conscience with a crime. As Whittier says,

"Pausing not for doubtful choice
Of evils great or small,"

you may

"Listen to the Inward Voice
That turns away from all."

And that is just what Friends did in the matter of slavery, lotteries, and other things; and they did it just because the Inward Voice was a reality. Not only so, but its revelations proved themselves to be of the greatest utility in the course of time.

Another subject which has proved of advantage to us is the Friends' attitude toward the Bible. This has been always the crucial object of attack of non-Christians. A century ago geology seemed like a dangerous enemy. But geology carried its points, and the Bible was not hurt. Then came on biology and evolution, with kindred results, and now we are in the throes of the agitation of that which is unfortunately called Higher Criticism. That too will probably establish many of its contentions, and still the Bible will stand as strong as ever. Of all

other bodies, Friends have had the least cause to fear these attacks, and the wisest of them have been the earliest to accept the teaching. Thomas Story, one of the first men of early Pennsylvania, a friend of Penn and a minister of great power, read in the rocks of Scarborough the refutation of the six-day theory of creation, nearly a century before the geologists. All down the line the Quaker spiritual attitude has placed us on a vantage ground.

This was due partly to the objection they frequently urged to calling the Bible the "Word of God." They took the broader conception that the Word, as used in the New Testament, meant any message of God. "The word was made flesh" referred to Christ. "The word was living and acting" referred to the Spirit. The conception which the ordinary person receives from the expression *Word of God* is that the Bible was a dictated revelation by God himself; hence a passage of Deuteronomy is of as universal and literal application as one in John, and the manifest discrepancies between the Old and New Testaments are put aside as transcending human ability to determine.

We have this carried to an extreme in the opinions of John Jasper, a colored clergyman who a few years ago proved impossible the roundness of the earth. The Bible speaks of the four corners of the earth, he says, and triumphantly adds, "How can a round

thing have four corners?" Now it is not, he says, any fallible man who makes this statement, but God Almighty himself, and therefore it is to be accepted as against all the dictates of common sense and ordinary science.

While this is an extreme case, it is the argument—sometimes veiled—of hundreds of Bible expositors, who take the obvious and easy meaning of separate texts and draw rules of theology and conduct from them. But Friends not only objected to the expression, they objected to taking things just as they seemed, and demanding a belief in literal infallibility. Robert Barclay tells of an uneducated Quaker minister of his day who boldly announced by the Spirit that a certain text was not properly in the Bible, which by a linguistic examination afterwards proved to be true. The need of spiritual illumination, and the weakness of merely intellectual conceptions, to bring home the real meaning and application of Bible readings, has always been urged. So the teaching of the Spirit became the highest authority, and the Bible was looked upon as a Book divinely inspired in its ultimate content, but written at various times and for various purposes, and understood by us as our minds were illumined to appropriate its deeper and underlying truths. This spiritual revelation of fundamental truth can never be touched by science and criticism, which may do their valuable work, and whose revela-

tions we may accept, not hastily, but whenever they become firmly established.

But the best evidence of the reality of spiritual guidance is the testimony and experience of two centuries of devout intelligent men, unbaptized by water, non-participants in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but believing and testifying by word and life to the fact that they have been baptized really by a Spirit which acts upon their life, and that they are in the habit of a daily communion which purifies their thoughts and is a practical guide to conduct. The man born blind cannot get a sense of color. He must receive such imperfect conception as he can second-hand, from the testimony of others. So the man spiritually blind through his own disobedience, may not believe and cannot conceive the sight of Divine things open to him in contact with a source of light denied to him. But he ought to be willing to accept the testimony of the multitudes of those who speak of what they do know. The writings of Friends are full of information on this point,—of ministers who saw clearly into the condition of those unknown to them, who against ordinary common-sense went to places because of an inward impulse, which proved right; of co-operation between two distant and stranger servants, wonderfully brought together in work to accomplish a certain point; and a host of others. I would not deny that some, perhaps many, of these

were coincidences, or accidents, or imaginations, or suggestions of others, mistaken for revelations. But you may eliminate all these, and yet you have a body of evidence that seems to me unshakable in favor of the fact that those who observe the conditions of Divine revelation in willingness and humility do receive intimations of truth denied to others.

What then can be more logical or reasonable than a Friends' meeting? If the Holy Spirit does speak to men, is not that Spirit, the Spirit which has wrought all the great moral and religious progress of history, the principal factor in worship? Should we not meet together, not with our minds full of other things, not to hear others' views of what God may think, but by power of will putting aside all these things, and opening our hearts to all the suggestions and influences of the Spirit addressed directly to us, and fitted, as no man can fit them, to our special conditions? There is a striking difference in the way in which a typical Friend and another approaches such a meeting. The Friend is solemnized by the responsibility that opens before him. No one can relieve him of it. He has his own positive duty before him. The other man, in many cases, goes to hear a sermon or the music, with an honest hope that he may be benefited. The one meeting is a meeting of positive worshipers; in many cases the other is a meeting of interested listeners; the one is individually active, the other passive; the

one can go on without any part of its membership or machinery, the other is lost without a leader. If, when all have come together in the spirit of devotion, there are words which need to be said, any one may say them as the impression is laid upon him. Every one is in the hands of that omniscient Being who knows the exact needs of each. This, it seems to me, is the most beautiful and the highest form of worship,—a form which, while indulging in no criticism on others, is one for which we ought to be thankful that we have inherited from our past history.

Such is the theory, but it has several weaknesses in practice,—some the accumulations of the ages, due to limitations on the Spirit's freedom, some incident to the weakness of human nature, and to the fact that we are not all worshipful Christians.

One of the difficult things that Friends have contended with is the minister's relation to education. George Fox said that a university education was not *essential* to a minister; but many of his followers of succeeding generations have developed the view that it was not *desirable*,—a very different proposition. It has been held that "human learning," as it is sometimes rather opprobriously called, is an actual bar to the ministry. May we never slight a true minister because he is uneducated. We know too well the power and usefulness of many untrained in the schools to deny any claims made for them. Here we

may always differ from those bodies which place education as an essential thing, and hence make college and seminary degrees a necessity. But the objection usually urged against educated ministers is that they are too full of human interests and conceits, that they are not teachable, and hence not responsive to the Spirit call. Personally I have not noticed this. Every one has his own conceits and interests and thoughts, the ignorant man no less than the educated, the difference being that in his case they are illogical and baseless. While there is a place for his ministry, there is also a place for the Friend of better opportunities and larger mental powers. This Friends have often failed to provide. The first generation of Friends contained many of them,—educated before they joined; but neither in England nor here in Pennsylvania, where the whole thing was in their hands, was there made any provision for their continuance. They lacked the incentive which founded Yale and Harvard and Princeton, the absolute necessity for an educated ministry. Had the Penn Charter School developed into a Quaker college, which it probably would have done had men like Penn and Lloyd and Logan been succeeded by others as well educated and broad-minded, giving it a half-century start on the institution which afterwards became the University of Pennsylvania, the whole history of Pennsylvania

and of Quakerism might have been differently written. After-educated men, ministers and others,—for in early times the educated men were nearly all ministers,—would have moulded Quaker thought on liberal lines, and commended it to others; the infusion of our principles into government would have been more powerful, and unfortunate separations might have been prevented.

However, I do not want to indulge in historical speculation, though it is very enticing. I only want to urge that any remnants still existing of the idea that higher education is a danger to our ministry or our spirituality should be destroyed,—while always guarding with jealous care the principle that upon whomsoever the fiery tongue of Pentecost descends, of whatever stage of society or education he may be, should not be denied equal recognition from the church.

I suppose inspiration is usually an inspiration of ideas. Such at least is the notion I gather from reading journals and talking to ministers of the present day. A thought or a subject is given, and around this the man gathers such modes of expression and illustrations and arguments as come readily to his intellect. There is the union of the divine and human element in every true sermon. True, there are accounts of cases where the man was lifted upon his feet and words were given to him, but these are prob-

ably rare. The process of dictation is, I apprehend, unusual. The man uses such material as his mental powers have accumulated to amplify the divinely-given thought or succession of thoughts. He is, therefore, liable to err. When the Biblical writer wanted to embrace the whole world, he expressed it by referring to the four corners of the earth. Very likely he thought the earth was square,—at all events he used, I suppose, a common expression of the idea; and the fact that modern science showed that the earth has no corners would not invalidate his authority. Nor would it in the case of the modern Friend who quoted Shakespeare, attributing the words to the Bible, or who referred to the “holy man of old,” when he was quoting, unknown to himself, Satan in the book of Job.

The man who confines his reading to the Bible will use only biblical illustrations; he who reads only Friends' writings will get their manner of thought and expression; the minister who is also a scientific man will clothe his thoughts in scientific language, and use scientific illustrations and accurate logic; while the man who is not anything in particular will wander along from one thought to another as they come into his mind, whether from a divine source or from his own suggestions.

Fifty years ago, when every child at Westtown read Cowper's poems till he had committed them to

memory, it was the most natural thing in the world to find them reproduced in sermons. And now, when men are studying biblical commentaries and literature, it may be assumed that they will abound in First-day meetings. All of this, I think, we must admit, and must be hospitable to all, judging of a man's gift not by his illustrations or manner or appearance, but by the spiritual judgment at the command of every sincere Christian. Nor is it right to argue a man's unbaptized condition if he does not happen to appeal to us at the time. His message may be for others, or it may be bread cast upon the waters.

The present is a time when it seems to me especially important that this most vital and characteristic of Friendly principles, the immediate teaching of the Spirit, should be especially insisted on as typified in our meetings for worship. For there seem to be signs of greater life and activity, spiritual and intellectual, than have sometimes existed. Such times may be times of the greatest blessing or the greatest danger. If we look only at the fearful side and obstruct everything that has life on account of possible danger, we shut off a God-given opportunity, as we have done many a time before, and hence create the very danger we wish to avoid, the danger of the final elimination of this Society as a body to bear up the principles of truth.

If we co-operate with it, encourage it and direct it,

it becomes the beginning of a new day of blessing for us. But it is important that at such times, of all others, that which is essential and fundamental in Quakerism should be plainly brought to the front. In our plans of church activity there is a demand for more religious expression than we have had in the past, and so we have First-day schools, and tea-meetings, and meetings for religious conference, where we do not deem it essential that each one should wait for a divine impulse before he speaks. If this idea spreads into our meetings for worship, then we have lost our best estate. It seems to me a very right and important thing in its place, but we must so instruct and guard our membership that the old meeting will commend itself to them, and they will ask no change. There may be few who would 'urge pre-arranged meetings as to song, sermon, or other service, or a ministry intellectual without being spiritual. But the demand may come, here as elsewhere, and the wise plan is not to pursue the suicidal policy of cutting off all life except it be according to certain traditional appearances, but to cherish life as above all things the one thing needful, and carefully show the superiority of our way of exercising it in meetings for worship. We cannot narrow the operations of the Spirit except to our own loss. We cannot assume that its teachings to our ancestors in every detail will be repeated, that all light was

given to them and nothing new to us; but we must open our minds and hearts to the needs of the present day.

The best theory of a meeting is useless without faithfulness. Every one of us is a minister, or may be. Many undoubtedly ought to be who have thwarted the purposes of their divine Teacher. They have disobeyed the early calls to service, to their own and the meeting's loss. It is not an easy thing to speak in a Friends' meeting, and there is not much danger that it will be too common, or too lightly undertaken. An impulse, a feeling to say something, is probably from the right source, and it may safely be so understood. It is a quiet constraint and not a miraculous call that we are to look for. Here again let Whittier interpret for us:

“O, then if gleams of truth and light
Flash o'er the waiting mind,
Unfolding to thy mental sight
The wants of human kind;
If, brooding over human grief,
The earnest wish is known
To soothe and gladden with relief
An anguish not thine own;

“Though heralded with naught of fear,
Or outward sign or show;
Though only to the inward ear
It whispers soft and low;
Though dropping as the manna fell,
Unseen, yet from above,
Noiseless as dew-fall, heed it well,—
Thy Father's call of love!

If every one were faithful, there would be many speaking, and there would be no loss to the dignity and solemnity of the meeting. We may well be on our guard against unauthorized sermons which hurt the quiet of a living meeting, but the brief, honest effort of a young person is the most solemnizing thing that I know, and I have no doubt we ought to have much more of it than we do in all our meetings.

In the possession of these great principles, some of which I think must be included in the commendation of Professor James, I think we may take an optimistic view of the future. The Spirit which has already triumphed over so much of evil will not now cease to work. The body which most clearly and practically and faithfully recognizes it and makes provision for it will go on to triumph. It may be that on account of our narrowness and unfaithfulness we shall die, while the principle we profess succeeds. But I hardly think so. There is enough left to build on. It may be that the tide has already turned. At any rate it is great encouragement to feel sure of firm ground under our feet, and that the Spirit which built up our Society may still be working for us.

THE BASIS OF QUAKER MORALITY.

I have been accustomed to consider the moral views of Friends as something distinct and apart from their theological positions. The questions of war and oaths, in which their beliefs have been different from those of many other Christians, while apparently excellent in themselves, did not seem to have very much bearing on the question of worship and ministry, and the relation of the individual to the Divine ruler. A further consideration, however, induces the belief that there is a necessary and logical relation between the two, and this relation will be found, I think, to cluster around three closely-associated principles.

The first of these is the supremacy of the individual conscience. This has been always emphasized, and is the logical result of the doctrine of individual divine guidance. The Society has always been what may be called a strongly individualistic society, as opposed to the highly developed organization. The right of a person to determine his own duty in such matters is a necessary corollary of the oft-expressed principle that there is a conscious revelation of God's will, apart from the unconscious enlightenment of the Church.

On the other hand, it was early seen that some organization was necessary, and during the three long

years that George Fox spent in Lancaster and Scarborough jails, he evolved a system of government for the new Society which it has retained practically intact to the present time. Almost immediately there arose the cry that human control was limiting the freedom of spiritual action, and that Fox was false to his own principles of spiritual liberty. How could it be, some said, that any meeting organization could have a place in a church where each individual was supernaturally guided in every line of work, church or secular, which he might undertake? Was not this a limitation of the very fundamental idea on which Quakerism was based? And so there arose the Wilkinson-Story division, which carried off a large body of earnest and honest Friends, as well as some who were less respectable.

Fox and the larger body seemed to have no answer to the arguments adduced, except that they believed that the plan of organization itself was as much a product of divine direction as the commands to the individual could ever be; that God was to work through this organization, and that it would not limit the spiritual opportunities of any individual. The matter was worked over in some good-tempered and much bitter controversy, and the unorganized body, as has always been the case in human history, disintegrated and disappeared. The plan of Fox seemed to provide for the very least amount of organization

consistent with permanency, and to allow to the greatest possible extent the freedom of the individual. While the extremists passed out of existence, the Society still remained most emphatically individualistic.

The seceders claimed that Fox was making himself something of a Pope, sending out missionaries and providing for their payment. They opposed singing in meeting, as tending towards a pre-arranged custom. Some went so far as to object to any formal times of meeting, holding that the Spirit would draw Friends together whenever it was proper for them to go. One of the most interesting of the various controversies which occurred was one in rhyme between William Rodgers and Thomas Elwood.

Rodgers says:

“Preachers approved by man beyond the sea went
Who, when they wanted money to proceed,
The church her cash did then supply their need.”

Elwood replies:

“The blest apostles sometimes others sent,
And sometimes also, sent by others, went.

.

Canst thou imagine they who thus were sent
On the mere motion of the apostle went?
No; they no question in themselves did find
The same good motion stirring up their mind;
With what the good apostle did advise
The Holy Ghost in them did harmonize.”

He asserts:

“That ’tis the Church’s duty to supply
The needful wants of all her ministry.”

The same question, I think, also came to an issue in a rather different way, in the Separation of 1827. It is perhaps not the full truth that this was on the line of doctrinal differences exclusively. It would probably be more correct to say that one body considered that questions concerning the divinity and atonement of Christ should be left to the individual conscience and judgment, while the other body held that their adoption was essential to membership in the Society of Friends. So through all the ages, in ecclesiastical matters, this controversy has been cropping out, widely affecting the capacity for work and the attitude towards other difficulties in the life of the Society.

We have often heard the objection feelingly urged to the appointment of a committee for church work throughout the year, that it is human guidance attempting to direct the ministerial function. This is simply an echo of the Wilkinson-Story division, and an illustration of the tendency which has always been prominent. It is indeed fortunate that it has been.

In a system of belief which involves divine guidance one finds it difficult to draw the exact line, where the human agency should cease and the divine direction should begin. It can never be rigidly drawn.

Does it extend to secular matters, and if so, to what extent? A minister of our Society, now deceased, told me on one occasion, that, desiring to purchase a certain farm, instead of examining the quality of land and its various other advantages, he sat down in the parlor of the house and tried to feel whether the purchase was right or not. He thought he received an affirmative response, and concluded the bargain without further inquiry, and to his own satisfaction. This, however, we would assume to be an exaggerated application of a principle which should be limited. A man must use his own powers to their fullest extent. They were given him for that purpose, and while he may probably expect unconscious divine aid if he is doing his duty, he can hardly shift the responsibility of the decision from his own judgment to the Holy Spirit. We may well assume that the large success of Friends in philanthropic movements has been due to their habit of acting as if divine direction were a reality; but somewhere in the course of human events there is a border line where conscious divine guidance ends and unconscious divine guidance begins. We cannot define it accurately, for it probably varies with different individuals, and from time to time in the life of the same individual.

That Friends have not been afraid of organization

to promote secular and charitable ends may be seen very clearly in the history of this Province. The responsibilities of government were thrown upon them, and they made no attempt to evade them. There was first the stormy period of adaptation, ending about 1710, during which political forces were as active and political machinery as much in evidence as in any period of the history of the colony or State. Then came the golden days, extending perhaps to 1750, when Quaker control was undisputed, and the Quaker machinery of government worked out results as inevitably as does the present machine which controls the fortunes of the State. The same men were high in office in state and in church. Against a proprietor who was continually trying to throw aside popular rights, a deputy who was his faithful and frequently unscrupulous ally, and a minority party which used war and oaths, and the other matters against which Friends protested, as pawns in a political game, the Friends attained complete and continued success through supremacy in the popular councils.

John Kinsey, who died in 1750, held many offices, both in church and state. Upon his death the signs of a reaction became more manifest. There grew up a party devoted to withdrawal from State affairs, and signs of a rift in the organization began to appear.

Though this and the voluntary resignation of the leaders gradually weakened the authority of the Quaker political machine, yet it maintained a large grasp upon the affairs of the government up to the time of the Revolution. That cataclysm ended it; but the organized power of Friends was turned in other directions. It showed itself in such institutions as the Pennsylvania Hospital, the Eastern Penitentiary, the development of educational institutions, the Frankford Asylum, and a host of charities.

Hence we have had the spectacle of a body growing more and more individualistic in church matters, and more and more effective in organization outside of the church. John Kinsey could rule the legislature, with public opinion behind him, and with the aid of a machine, the details of which we know too little about, which sent up a great majority to his support every year; but when he got into the Yearly Meeting, he was one person among the multitude. He no longer carried his points by machinery, but permitted any individual, great or small, who felt that he had a message from above, to break in at any time upon the established order of business.

It could not be otherwise than that Friends, with their basic principle of Divine guidance, would be faithful to religious liberty. It is perfectly natural, also, that it should have been made a corner-stone for other institutions. Again and again William Penn

returns to it with enthusiasm as the most important feature of the new government. Many of his own friends faltered. His legislature, much to his indignation, adopted tests which prevented Catholics from taking part in the affairs of government. Some of them could not see the fallacy of the argument that, since this was a Quaker government, Quakers must have special privileges. But Penn did not waver. He was sure he was right, and he forced the doctrine into every constitution, and it now stands as an imperishable memorial to his advanced ideas of government.

And so it worked out that in government and in private life this principle of liberty of conscience has become a kind of corner-stone of Quaker thought. That which the individual believes to be right, that must he do, and no ecclesiastical or political court, no power on earth, can abolish the allegiance which he owes to his God, as understood by him in his own conceptions of duty.

Conscience is a fickle guide. It varies with every new light one receives. No two honest people think alike. One hardly has the same conscience in all respects for two successive days; and yet to the individual, for the time being, it is supreme. It is a mental faculty through which the voice of God gives its directions, through which the light that comes from the teaching of another individual is recognized,

through which the subtle magnetisms which crowd in upon the human soul, one hardly knows whence, modifying its beliefs and motives of action, are pressing.

Conscience is very fallible. I have known a young man who was brought into court on the true charge of stealing. His lawyer told him to plead "not guilty," and that there was not evidence enough to convict him. "But," he replied, "I am guilty." "That makes no difference," said the lawyer, "it is only a technical plea. You say 'Not guilty,' and I will take care of the rest." But he said, "I could not tell a lie, and will not plead 'Not guilty.'" He did not, and was sent to jail, and while there stole from a fellow prisoner. His conscience was perfectly right on the matter of lying, but did not work at all when it came to stealing.

A respected moralist tells us in his book on lying that under no circumstances is deception right. He illustrates it by an incident in his own experience. When he was in Libby prison during the war, he could have escaped if he had told a lie to his guard. His conscience prevented him from using this method, but he says that if he could have killed his guard, it would have been perfectly right. To many of us murder under such circumstances would have been quite as revolting as falsehood.

It is said that in the Southern colleges a student

can get drunk with very little loss of prestige, but that anything like cheating or lying meets with instant condemnation, and the culprit is forced out of the institution. In the North, on the contrary, drunkenness is a vice which brings loss of respect, while cheating, under certain conditions, is a very venial fault. One can readily see how differently the conscience of the neutral young man would be educated under different conditions.

And yet, with it all, the conscience is supreme, and no body more fully recognizes this fact than ours. When we have taken up any subject, such as war, on which our attitude differs from that of other Christian bodies, we have not so much made it a matter of argument as of conscientious conviction, and we have assumed that for us this settles the case. We have, or should have, permitted the same view to be taken by others. While we may admit that the motives which have taken some people to war have been selfish, in other cases they have been a stern sense of duty. We have respected this, and have not attempted to detract aught from the reputation of the men who, under such influences, have undergone the dreary strain of camp life and the risks of battle. But we have asked that in this respect our own consciences should be considered as vitally essential to us.

The conclusions we must come to with reference to this part of the subject are, therefore, (1) that

individual liberty in matters of duty has been and should be a prominent feature in Friends' system; (2) that effective organization is needed to do the work, secular and religious, which Friends undertake to do, and as a corollary to the other two; (3) that the organization should be of that elastic sort which in all benevolent work permits the largest freedom for the individual consistent with the general good, and in ministry and worship almost perfect freedom.

Our second principle is the belief in a moral order, a divine law of right, as against utilitarianism. In our Yearly Meetings how dead has often fallen an appeal in favor of some course of action, on account of its results, which sounded all right. The gallery Friends have been unmoved, because, without their appreciating it, the habit of argument from effect to cause has never been a part of their mental equipment. They base their beliefs on a *principle*, strained perhaps sometimes, and follow where it leads.

It is difficult to define the moral law, and still more difficult to apply it; but in the evolution of society, certain principles have grown up, based on the constitution of man and his relations to his fellows. They are more elusive than many physical laws, but they exist, and when men square their actions by them, they do good, and advance the interests of humanity. If they thwart them, they do evil and retard

progress, and this is independent of their motives in selecting a given course of action. That they think they see some collateral good to come from a bad action, may excuse the short-sighted doer, but does not avoid the general bad consequences of the immoral act. These laws may or may not all be written in the sacred books of the various religions. If so, it is but a record of them, not their origination. Sometimes, they are embodied in the civil law, and sometimes, without doubt, the students of the undeveloped science of international law have found them.

Now the question comes to the front, Do good men, who hire others to lie for them that good may come, do good nations that commit the manifold iniquities of war, even legitimate war, for the sake of humanity, really do good? It does not aid in answering these questions to point to good results accomplished, for the algebraic sum of results for all time to come must be a positive quantity, if the course is really expedient. A Christian martyr would have had a very plausible case if he had argued that life at the sacrifice of a little principle would have been better for his cause than an entire removal from opportunities of usefulness; but he would have made a mistake. His law of right, intuitively felt, kept him to his duty, and in the long run the right became the expedient.

A man (or a nation) might always refuse to do wrong, and take the consequences, if he had the

courage and the faith; and every one who has more confidence in eternal law than in human prophecy may well hesitate to adopt wrong expedients, whether "civilized" or "uncivilized," permitted by law or not permitted, if they transgress the established principles of morals. You do not *have* to do wrong. You may have to suffer, you may have to die, but no power on the earth or under the earth can make a man do wrong without his own consent.

At a recent Mohonk Conference a rear-admiral of the navy said: "Christianity has been preached for nineteen centuries, and it would be strange indeed if such results (arbitration) did not follow; for to me, a layman, it seems axiomatic that just in proportion as individuals are guided by the principles of the Golden Rule, war will disappear."

After such an admission as this, it would seem to a Friend that nothing more need be said. This is his whole contention, and here he rests the case. But others do not. The rear-admiral fights if necessary. So does General Sherman, and so would hosts of Christian ministers who rightly characterize war in their sermons as a barbarous and wicked custom. By what course of argument do they justify their seeming incongruity? By argument from results entirely. By pointing out the good effects of some wars, and the bad effects it seems to them would follow if they declined war under certain circumstances.

The Friend's differences with them are not fundamental as to the character of war, but he has a different system of determining conduct. *He* prefers to believe that the Divine Ruler of the affairs of men instituted certain moral laws which in the long run will work out the best results. *They* place their own judgment in the scale, and see a better way which in this particular emergency nullifies the Christian law, and establishes in its place a law of expediency, a law which says, Do as much good as you can in every determination of conduct; choose the less of two evils; do that which would be otherwise evil that good may come.

The third feature, again and again impressed upon young Friends, and which has done much to develop the Quaker character, has been the transcendent importance of faithfulness in small details. It is only in this way, say the preachers, that spirituality can develop. It is every-day obedience alone which creates strength to meet great emergencies. New light dawns upon the waiting soul when it uses the light previously received. Spiritual strength, as all other strength, comes from exercise. Unfaithfulness in a little matter checks the whole current of divine inflow, and life and growth are not possible till the obstruction is removed.

So the whole power of conscience is brought to bear on each minute item of conduct, and a careful-

ness is begotten not rare in the typical Friend. Sometimes, as with John Woolman, this leads to self-imposed restrictions which make life extremely difficult, and at times almost impossible; but which, reacting on character, creates an unselfishness and consecration, an indifference to criticism, and a desire for the approval of conscience only, which often sweetens and dignifies life in the highest degree. This is in harmony with modern psychology, which teaches the force of habit and the power acquired by persistence; but the Friends did not get it from psychology. It is a definite result of their belief in direct Divine guidance, which touches thought and action at every point, making each one of them momentous.

The best representatives of the type of Friend prevalent a half century ago are held in high esteem. Honest to the core, scrupulously truthful in word and action, with a kindly courtesy which disarmed opposition, yet positively unyielding in a matter of duty, charitable to a fault, yet without publicity, they quite fulfilled one's ideal of the Christian gentleman. From journals and descriptions and from personal acquaintance we know enough to judge how it was that this character was developed. Their life had been hedged around with limitations of conscience. This conscience was the most sacred thing in it. Obedience meant blessing, and disobedience meant a curse. The force of habit made the character by in-

sensible accumulations of the consequences of right actions. This conscience led them into peculiarities of dress and language which made them separate from other people, and this separateness reacted upon their habits of thought, producing the strong unselfish instincts of self-development along spiritual lines. When through preaching or heavenly visitation the boy or the girl became awakened to a consciousness of guilt and the need of a reformed and renewed life, the first propulsions of conscience came along the line of youthful teaching and example, and in the stress of internal conflict peace was found in external conformity to its demands. This was the beginning, and from this, faithfulness to new revelations gradually extinguished the worst forms of selfishness, and the mystical tendencies were strengthened into saintliness and quietude.

Tennyson's knight, "who revered his king as if he were his conscience, and his conscience as his king, who spoke no evil, no, nor listened to it, who rode abroad redressing human wrong," was a Quaker in disguise.

Do any Friends pass through this spiritual discipline to-day? and if not, is the old type to be lost? To adopt means of self-mortification simply for discipline's sake is a form of asceticism which is only a secondary product of Quakerism. It was not the original idea. The singular pronoun and the hat ques-

tion were protests in favor of human equality. The plain dress was a testimony against extravagant fashions. They were originally "openings," to use George Fox's expression, which struck at some current evil and sought its abolishment. All of John Woolman's conscientious restrictions were accepted by him, not for his own sake, but to reform society. Incidentally they developed and sweetened his own character, but this was a secondary and unsought result.

Does not this indicate the line of thought and action for present-day Friends? An easy Quakerism, one that gives its life up to business as the ordinary business man follows it, and its leisure to pleasant recreation, that will not follow a purer morality than the world accepts, regardless of losses and suffering and hardness and discomfort, may make very reputable citizens and men of honor and standing; but it will not make Friends. The fact that they hold certain beliefs different from other bodies does not necessarily change their characters, and without a change of spirit and of character the old and best mind of the past cannot exist.

When the Society of Friends becomes simply a body of estimable gentlemen carrying on philanthropic and educational activities, in an honest and efficient way, without a deep, underlying sense

of self-sacrificing duty, then a new and inferior type of Quakerism is developed.

The old peculiarities of garb and speech seem to be passing away. This may or may not be a subject of regret. I notice that many Friends are sorry that *others* are not maintaining the testimonies. This, however, is only sentiment, and not conviction. They did have their disciplinary value for our fathers and mothers, and if they go, shall there be any substitutes?

The answer to this question seems to me to be that new testimonies must arise to take their place, testimonies which will involve the same self-denial, and which will appeal to the consciences of the present age. The evils of the world have not all disappeared. Obsequiousness may have largely gone; democracy may be established in the hearts of men, and the "thee" and the "thou" may have lost their value. But the business man cannot do his work, the professional man cannot practice his profession, the man of leisure cannot enjoy his recreation, without being conscious of many departures from strict rectitude in the standards of the times. There will be many an opportunity to do his duty against prevailing sentiment, and doubtless oftentimes to his own financial or social loss and discomfort. He must stand up to his duty, and not fall in with the world and its spirit and methods.

Then there are the great world-wide evils of society. Is strong drink an evil? Then a testimony of no uncertain character must be held up against it, even should this involve abstinence from a habit not hurtful, and often pleasurable to one's self. Is war an evil? A few Quaker martyrs, with the consciences of those that in Cromwell's day went to jail for not taking an oath, might aid in ending it. He who lives in the spirit of these old martyrs will find plenty of living testimonies which he may and must adopt, and he, too, will find, like them, a secondary effect, which he will not strive for directly, in a sweetened and purified and exalted Christian character. Testimonies against evil, each one adopting his own from his own revelations of duty, to which he must be ever attentive, pressed upon an unbelieving generation with all faithfulness and all tenderness, to be lived for and died for, will continue to produce the best of the old type of Friend.

INDEX.

INDEX.

Ap John, John, convinced by George Fox,	145
Ashbridge, George, on "backing out,"	86
Assembly of Pennsylvania, struggle over war appropriations, 45; triumph in elections,	47
Bancroft, George, on Quaker government of North Carolina,	82
"Barony," The Welsh,	140, 148
Bryan, George, author of abolition law,	178
Bryn Mawr, "speak-easy" in,	17
Constitution, Federal, Pennsylvania's ratification of,	73
Davies, Isaac, sufferings of,	156
Davies, Richard, story of his courtship, 146; persecution of, 148	
Fothergill, Dr., criticism of John Kinsey,	134
Fox, George, convinces John ap John, 145; organization of Society of Friends,	203
Franklin, Benjamin, on Friends and war, 37; on Friends, .	130
Germans, sympathy with Friends on war,	132
Hamilton, Alexander, trade of votes with Jefferson,	74
Hamilton, Andrew, on Penn's constitution,	42, 57, 114
Harrison, General W. H., on the character of the Indians .	33
Indians, esteem for Penn, 35; General Harrison's opinion of, 33	
James, Professor William, on Quakerism,	180
Keith, Governor, order to remove hat,	115
Kinsey, John, in politics and religious affairs,	86, 115, 208

Lloyd, David, first Pennsylvania "boss," 84; defeat of, .	111
Lloyd, Thomas, emigration to Pennsylvania, 149; dispute with Governor Blackwell,	151
Logan, James, views on war,	128
Lotteries, prevalence of,	38
Moon, James, work against slavery,	164
Morris, Gouverneur, opinion of the Second Congress,	75
Norris, Isaac, explains grant of money to the Queen,	111
Oaths, Friends' testimony against,	40
Parkman, Francis, on Penn's policy,	32
Pastorius, Francis Daniel, emigration to Pennsylvania, ..	149
Pemberton, Israel, Jr., contest with Gov. Keith,	135
Pemberton, James, letter of,	68
Penn, William, advanced views, 19; his constitution for Pennsylvania, 21, 52; his dealings with the Indians, 31; Diet of Nations, 36; advice to his children, 79; debts of, 80; biographer's opinion of, 107; views about war, 123, 125; grant of Welsh "Barony,"	150
Philosophical Society, American,	44
Roberts, John, put to death,	157
Roosevelt, Theodore, "Life of Benton," 51; a consistent partisan, .	102
Sauer, Christopher, influence in Pennsylvania,	132
Smith, Dr. William, on Quaker success in politics,	131
Thomas, George, lieutenant-governor of Pennsylvania, 117; controversy with Assembly about war, 118; salary cut off, .	129
Washington, George, denunciations of,	74
Wilkinson-Story division in Society of Friends,	203
Woolman, John, work against slavery,	161
Wynne, Dr. Thomas, emigration to Pennsylvania,	149

